

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/55881>

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it. Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

Jean Guéhenno : an inter-war intellectual

Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D. in the
University of Warwick

by

Stanisław Jan Librowski

October 1985

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS USED

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page No</u>
Chapter 1. Childhood, education and the Great War (1890-1919)	1
Chapter 2. Apprenticeship (1919-1928)	77
Chapter 3. <u>Caliban parle</u>	130
Chapter 4. <u>Journal d'un homme de 40 ans</u>	187
Chapter 5. <u>Europe</u>	248
Chapter 6. <u>Vendredi</u>	349
Chapter 7. Conclusion - <u>Journal d'une "Révolution"</u>	474
Bibliography	537

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout the period of my work on this thesis, I have benefited greatly from the help afforded me by a number of individuals and public organisations.

I am therefore deeply indebted to Mme. Annie Guéhenno for allowing me to examine her husband's private correspondence, which enabled me to resolve matters which would otherwise have been left open to speculation. Furthermore, I wish to thank Mme. Annie Guéhenno for granting me permission to include unpublished material in this thesis, and for being willing to comment on my observations, which often involved reference to documents in her possession. This was of the greatest assistance to me in the development of perspectives on Jean Guéhenno's work.

My thanks are also due to the librarian and staff of the following libraries: The British Library's Department of Printed Books as well as its Newspaper Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale, the University of Warwick Library, and the Bibliothèque des Lettres of the Université de Pau. The willingness of the latter two libraries to acquire Jean Guéhenno's works is particularly appreciated.

Finally I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. N. Hewitt, for his advice and assistance over the past four years, and to my mother for her financial help throughout this period.

Abbreviations used

- E.E. Jean Guéhenno, L'Évangile éternel. Paris, Grasset, 1927. All quotations from Paris, Grasset, 1962.
- C.P. Jean Guéhenno, Caliban parle. Paris, Grasset, 1928. All quotations from Paris, Grasset, "Caliban parle suivi de Conversion à l'humain", 1962.
- S.M. Jean Guéhenno, Simon Mondzain. Paris, Gallimard, 1931.
- C.à H. Jean Guéhenno, Conversion à l'humain. Paris, Grasset, 1931. All quotations from Paris, Grasset, "Caliban parle suivi de Conversion à l'humain", 1962.
- J.40. Jean Guéhenno, Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. Paris, Grasset, 1934. All quotations from Paris, Grasset, 1962.
- J.F. Jean Guéhenno, Jeunesse de la France. Paris, Grasset, 1936.
- J.R. Jean Guéhenno, Journal d'une "Révolution". Paris, Grasset, 1939.
- L.F.D.M. Jean Guéhenno, La France et le monde. Paris, Éditions de la Liberté, 1946.
- J.D.A.N. Jean Guéhenno, Journal des années noires (1940-44). Paris, Gallimard, 1947. All quotations from Paris, Gallimard, 1973.
- L.P.D.F. Jean Guéhenno, La part de la France. Genève, Éditions du Mont-Blanc, coll. Espaces, 1949.

- V. Jean Guéhenno, Voyages. Tournée américaine. Tournée africaine. Paris, Gallimard, 1952.
- F.D. Jean Guéhenno, La Foi difficile. Paris, Grasset, 1957.
- S.L.C.H. Jean Guéhenno, Sur le chemin des hommes. Paris, Grasset, coll: Les cahiers verts, 1959.
- C.V. Jean Guéhenno, Changer la vie (Mon enfance et ma jeunesse). Paris, Grasset col: "Les cahiers verts", 1961. All quotations from Paris, Grasset, 1978.
- C.Q.J.C. Jean Guéhenno, Ce que je crois. Paris, Grasset, 1964.
- L.M.D.A. Jean Guéhenno, La Mort des autres. Paris, Grasset, 1968.
- C. & P. Jean Guéhenno, Caliban et Prospero. Suivi d'autres essais. Paris, Gallimard, 1969.
- C.D.V.E. Jean Guéhenno, Carnets du vieil écrivain. Paris, Grasset, 1971.
- D.L.D.P. Jean Guéhenno, Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs. Paris, Grasset, 1977.

ABSTRACT

The study of Jean Gu  henno in the inter-war years is divided into three main parts. The first deals with the development of Gu  henno's personality and ideas, which preceded the publication of his major works, and explores his debt to certain literary figures. The second deals with the main texts Caliban parle and Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, whilst the third explores his role as editor and director of Europe and Vendredi respectively.

The first chapters consider the difficulties Gu  henno encountered in reconciling academic success with his poor origins. Moreover they present the problem of his experience of the First World War, his decision to become a teacher and the influence of Daniel Hal  vy in his early literary career.

The second part is an analysis of Gu  henno's two most important texts. With respect to Caliban parle the issues raised include co-existence in a world without God, the solution of a contractual society with all its implications for culture, and the problem of revolution as a personal spiritual ideal. In the case of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, where Gu  henno reaffirms his earlier individualism, his discovery of a style to suit his intellectual preoccupations is considered, as is the fact that his work is primarily a personal protest against war.

The third section of the thesis deals with Gu  henno's role in Europe as well as in Vendredi and with the extent to which these papers reflected the interests of his major works. Furthermore, in the case of Vendredi the problem of the confrontation between idealism and political necessity posed by "engagement" is examined, using Gu  henno's articles on the Front Populaire and the U.S.S.R.

The conclusions drawn are that Gu  henno is an important influential and representative member of the group of "intellectuels engag  s" which worked in France in the inter-war years, because his work raises their common problems of intellectuality, class, culture and pacifism. Equally importantly however, his case illustrates the dangers posed by intellectual commitment to a political cause - dangers which led him to adopt an ultimately conservative position, and which on a more general level led to the dispersal of the "intellectuels engag  s" as a group.

INTRODUCTION

In the preface to La Rive gauche, his major work on French inter-war intellectuals, Herbert R. Lottmann proposes the "intellectuels engagés" as the subject of his study. He does so because he is convinced that the actions and attitudes of this group constitute a major phenomenon in inter-war intellectual history:

"Ce récit commence dans le Paris des années trente, lorsqu'un groupe restreint d'hommes et de femmes - qui n'étaient pas tous français, mais qui presque tous étaient des écrivains (ou des journalistes, ou des professeurs) - apparut sur la scène internationale. Dans le monde entier, l'élite intellectuelle s'intéressait à leurs faits et gestes; leurs manifestes rencontraient un écho jusque dans l'Amérique capitaliste et la Russie stalinienne. Certains furent invités à venir témoigner loin de chez eux - aux Etats-Unis ou en Union soviétique; d'autres se rendirent à Berlin, pour défier Hitler (ou pour le glorifier); un certain nombre enfin combattirent en Espagne, lors de la guerre civile... L'année 1930 et l'année 1950 marquent à peu près les frontières de cette période, qui vit la montée puis le déclin des "intellectuels engagés". Quand la fumée se dissipa, la plupart d'entre eux, les meilleurs, avaient cessé de s'intéresser publiquement aux affaires du monde" (1)

In many respects one of the most representative as well as the most influential figures of this group, which included among its members André Gide, André Malraux, Louis Aragon, Henri Barbusse, Jean-Richard Bloch, André Chamson, Tristan Tzara, and Ilya Ehrenbourg, was Jean Guéhenno. Nevertheless, whereas most of these writers have been studied individually, and have figured prominently in studies of the inter-war period undertaken by David Caute, H. Stuart-Hughes and Herbert R. Lottman, the role of Jean Guéhenno is only rarely

mentioned. This is surprising given Guéhenno's considerable importance, as well as his great influence at that time, both as an essayist and as a journalist. Together with Alain, the only other major essayist of the inter-war period, as editor of Europe and later as a director of Vendredi, Guéhenno was able to play a crucial role in shaping left-wing public opinion throughout the 1930's. Given these facts the contemporary lack of interest in him is to be regretted, because he was not only a major figure of the period, but exemplified a certain number of problems, which dominated the thoughts of his generation of intellectuals.

These problems are primarily associated with countries which Lottman regards as being the main areas of influence of the "intellectuels engagés". Spain, Germany, the Soviet Union and the United States of America are therefore states which attracted Guéhenno's interest in the 1930's, when he wrote frequent articles on them, particularly in Vendredi. Nevertheless it is because these states serve as a background to a more general discussion of the problems related to the central notion of "engagement" that they are so important to Guéhenno and his group of friends. His work of the inter-war years exemplifies "engagé" writing, and his concern with specific régimes poses the question of the objectives of intellectual political commitment. This in turn raises the wider issues of peace, culture and social justice.

It was at the time of the Front Populaire, that the "intellectuels engagés" experienced their most active and influential period, at home as well as abroad. Guéhenno's role at this time placed him at the forefront of this activity, but his conduct as co-director of

Vendredi demonstrated both the hopes and the pitfalls of "engagement". Guéhenno's personal experiences certainly raise the problem of how the Front Populaire was perceived by Left-wing intellectuals who placed their faith in it, but equally importantly they question the possibility of a progressive but non-communist commitment. The eventual dispersal of the group of "intellectuels engagés" referred to by Lottman, make these problems matters of prime importance, because the group fragmented on specific issues. The difficulties of maintaining an agreed perspective on Spain, the Soviet Union and the performance of the Front Populaire government, initially resulted in personal conflicts of conscience, but these soon led to public disputes and the destruction of the group's unity. In this respect Guéhenno's fate in the late 1930's can serve to illustrate that of his friends. Furthermore the decline in his public importance from 1938 onwards, is linked closely to the similar decline of the group as a whole. Hence if Guéhenno's work is worthy of extended study, it is that produced when he was an "intellectuel engagé".

In the years following the Occupation, Guéhenno sought acceptance for his work as an individual author, rather than as a member of a group or movement. This he did by relying increasingly on his childhood, as a source of material, but the concentration on the effects of a provincial childhood as a prelude to becoming a Parisian intellectual, did little to advance his arguments of the inter-war years. Nonetheless, notwithstanding the less than successful attempts to re-establish himself as a writer after 1945, Guéhenno remains an important, interesting and revealing figure of the inter-war years, whose influence should not be forgotten.

Footnotes

1. Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, Marianne Véron trans.
Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1981.

Chapter One

Childhood, education, and the Great War (1890-1919).

Although Jean Guéhenno's published work is almost exclusively autobiographical, he nonetheless reveals very few details about his ancestors. The inter-war works limit themselves to the Guéhenno family history after the birth of Jean, and it is only in the late post-1945 works that information concerning the earlier period, first appears (1). Despite this scarcity of details, certain important facts about the family can however be established.

Guéhenno's paternal grandfather, the earliest ancestor about whom anything of substance is known, originally came from Pontivy, in the Morbihan area of Brittany (2), but the family's links with the area are undoubtedly more ancient. Evidence for this is provided by the existence of a nearby village called Guéhenno, renowned for the beauty of its "calvaire" (3). The grandfather was "an ancien soldat, grave (qui)...avait été à Solferino et...ne buvait jamais. Il menait les chevaux" (C.V. p.51). In the course of one battle his commanding officer died on the battlefield and left him his watch (4). Returning to Pontivy, Guéhenno's grandfather worked for a wood-merchant (5), and did his best to support his growing family. Of the five children - three daughters and two sons (6), the youngest child, Jean-Marie was born in Pontivy on the 22nd April 1863 (7). A few years later, the grandfather's employer transferred his business from Pontivy to Fougères, which resulted in the entire Guéhenno family moving there with him (8). In Changer la vie Jean Guéhenno recalls that "le voyage dans la famille était devenu légendaire, bien plus que celui d'Ulysse ou d'Enée" (C.V. p.51). The journey through Josselin, Plélan, Rennes and Saint-Aubin-du-Cormier (9), made a permanent impression on Jean-Marie, "mon père, je pense bien, ne se réveilla jamais de

certaines rêves qu'il fit alors. Ce n'était pas à Fougères qu'ils allaient. Ils étaient en route vers la terre promise" (C.V. p.52). Fougères however, was to prove to be anything but a promised land:

"Peu de temps après leur arrivée à Fougères, mon grand-père mourut. Ma grand-mère resta seule avec ses cinq enfants. Elle continua à faire des ménages, le frère aîné devint apprenti cordonnier, les soeurs travaillèrent à l'ouvroir de la Providence" (C.V. p.52).

Only Jean-Marie escaped the consequences of his family's poverty. In his son's account "toute la maisonnée travaillait pour lui. Il avait une jolie voix et devint enfant de chœur à Sant-Léonard" (C.V. p.52). Ill health enabled Jean-Marie to maintain his privileged position in the family,

"vers ses onze ans il eut une étrange maladie... il avait toujours faim...une faim que rien ne rassasiait. Cela dura bien une année durant laquelle tout le monde se priva pour lui. C'est à cette époque que son frère le surnomma 'l'aristo'" (C.V. pp.52-53).

Being over-protected by the entire family, was however ultimately damaging to him, as he became lazy and complacent, "il était sans ambition. On ne put jamais le décider à aller au collège où il aurait pu obtenir une bourse. Il avait hâte d'être libre, de gagner sa vie et d'être cordonnier" (C.V. p.53). Consequently as the age of thirteen he followed in the footsteps of his elder brother, becoming an apprentice cobbler (10), "non pas contraint par le besoin, mais de sa pleine volonté (C.V. p.53). As a craftsman of considerable skill, he frequently worked on private orders, and was always given the honour of making shoes for the wife of each succeeding employer (11).

Despite being a care-free young man, Jean-Marie chose as his wife a woman of quite different character. Angélique Girou "grande et

belle" (12) worked as a "piqueuse" (13) and unlike her husband, knew the full meaning of dire poverty from bitter personal experience. Memories of this period figured frequently in her later conversations with her son, and are recalled in Changer la vie. Natives of Fougères (14),

"ils (les Girou) étaient six enfants, deux garçons et quatre filles. Leur père (15) était mort. Leur mère s'était remariée et les avait abandonnés. Alors les deux aînés, ma mère et son frère avaient dû élever les quatre autres. Le frère était coupeur dans une usine. Elle tenait la maison. Ils vivaient de galettes de blé noir, de pommes de terre et de châtaignes" (C.V. p.72).

Life for the Girou children was not made any easier by Angélique's proud and defiant nature. Although the convent of "Les soeurs de Rillé" distributed free clothing, shoes and butter (16) to the poor, "on devait, pour se présenter aux distributions, porter, si l'on était fille, un sarrau gris et un béguin blanc" (C.V. p.72). Angélique was too proud to put on the uniform, "le béguin surtout lui faisait horreur. Donc on avait dû vivre uniquement de la paie du grand frère" (C.V. p.72). Pride also prevented her from joining her brothers and sisters on their Sunday excursions to collect wood in the forest. Eventually a compromise was reached: "(son Frère) revenait tard de la forêt avec les petits...Alors elle allait à leur rencontre et tirait à la corde avec les petits... Il n'y avait plus personne pour la voir, et la nuit cachait sa honte" (C.V. p.73). Even such a resolute spirit can, however be broken. Her son describes her as she was in later life, "chrétienne et résignée...qui savait souffrir" (C.V. p.6). "Je revois le visage de ma mère, tout ridé par l'angoisse, et ses yeux pleins de peur" (C.V. p.70). Hunger was her greatest fear, even though in reality

there was little likelihood that the family would starve (17). Fearful of the future, Angélique became superstitious, and took to consulting the local medium La Veillard. "Ma mère ne passait jamais devant la fenêtre de la Veillard sans être tentée...Elle résistait...mais je sais qu'elle la faisait venir chez nous quelquefois quand mon père et moi étions absents" (C.V. p.82). Having no ambition for herself, Angélique did nothing in later years to encourage her son. Indeed, he recalls that she did everything to discourage him from pursuing his dreams (18).

This son, christened Marcel Jules Marie, but better known as Jean, was born in Fougères on the 25th March 1890 (19). He was the second of Angélique and Jean-Marie's two children, but was brought up as their only child, the first having died in infancy (20). The birth was hardly an occasion for joy, as extreme poverty meant that a child was "de trop" (C.V. p.76), and moreover the child was the result of an unplanned pregnancy. In his first autobiographical work Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, Guéhenno claims that "les auteurs de mes jours ne m'attendaient pas. Ils m'eussent volontiers laissé dans l'autre monde" (J.40. p.19). Nevertheless both parents took their responsibilities towards their son seriously, and did their best to make his life a happy one (21). It being impossible for Angélique to look after the child herself, due to pressure of work (22), she sent him to be looked after by "une grande-tante maternelle dans un village, à huit kilomètres de la ville où je demeurai jusqu'à cinq ans" (J. 40. pp.19-20). This great-aunt had considerable experience as a wet-nurse, having brought up "au moins une vingtaine de petits hommes" (C.V. p.17), so young Guéhenno was placed in safe and competent hands.

The practise of sending children to wet-nurses among working-class mothers was a common one (23), and in Jean Guéhenno's case the five years he spent in Peñné (24), were the happiest of his life. Alain Decaux, in his tribute to Guéhenno on the occasion of his own election to the Académie Française claims that "il (Guéhenno) en a conservé un souvenir émerveillé"(25). In later years Guéhenno refers to it as a lost paradise (26). Happiness at the time, involved the satisfaction of the young child's egocentric nature by the people and environment around him. Loved by everyone, he took great pleasure in changing the flow of nearby streams with his bare hands (27). Guéhenno's self-involvement was almost narcissistic: "je me souviens, il y avait... une fontaine, le premier et le plus beau miroir où je me sois miré... la fontaine était sacrée" (C.V. p.18). Separation from their son, meant that his parents treated their Sunday visits as opportunities to spoil him, "ils passaient le jour à m'adorer" (J.40. p.25). It was therefore to be expected that Jean would grow up self-involved, and that he would seek to demonstrate this self-involvement by developing singular interests. The discovery of a cemetery where a count, his mistress, and his dog were buried opened to him "le pathétique empire de l'exceptionnel et du singulier" (C.V. p.36). In later life he recalls only one problem which occupied his thoughts at this time - the inability to escape the presence of God. In Changer la vie he claims that: "cette éternelle surveillance m'agaçait...Je la sentais toujours à mes trousses" (C.V. p.26). The problem persisted throughout his childhood, becoming acute at the time of his first communion, when forgetting to mention a sin at confession resulted in trauma: "tandis qu'on...me passait

mon premier pantalon long, j'éclatai en larmes et déclarai à ma mère que je ne pouvais pas aller communier" (C.V. pp.28-29). Nonetheless it was in Peñné that Guéhenno experienced happiness, even though this was short lived. He retained his contact with the place for many years afterwards, returning each summer (28), whilst his baby shoes became treasured relics for him, helping "à faire revivre en ma mémoire ma vraie patrie, le vieux pays ouvert et libre dont j'ai été le petit roi ensaboté"(J.40. p.33)(29). Even in such an idyllic setting, however, Guéhenno was obliged to accept that his kingdom "n'était qu'illusoire" (J.40. p.29). Caught trespassing in the park of the baron de V. by the baron's young son, he recalls how he was chased by a dog and forced to acknowledge "(son) premier maître" (J.40. p.31). This incident prepared Guéhenno for the much more restricted life he was to lead on his return to Fougères.

Guéhenno returned to Fougères aged five (30), to live with his parents in a single room on the third floor of the Maison Bruant (31) in the rue du Rillé. The room contained two beds, a table, chairs, two wardrobes, a gas cooker, a coal fire, washing lines, the workshop of Jean-Marie and the sewing machine of Angélique (32). To Guéhenno, returning from the country, the Maison Bruant seemed like a prison (33), as he also found it difficult to relate to his new friends. In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, he will describe them as "déjà des petits animaux domestiques, (ils) craignaient le gendarme...allaient droit comme les rues..." (J.40. p.21). Not surprisingly his memories of Fougères are negative. Even the one event which was supposed to provide distraction, the visit of President Félix Faure in August 1896 (34), was a frustrating experience for Guéhenno.

He was so jealous of the girl who presented flowers to the President, that he burst into tears, and had to be led away by his father (35). Guéhenno also recalls the presidential visit as a popular fête marked by social unity, or rather the docility of the masses: "les verrières de la gare tremblaient du formidable hurrah... Pas un coup de sifflet, pas un cri dissonant. Le Président put juger quelle population docile aux lois nous faisons" (J.40. p.40). Such a reception no doubt delighted the snobbish (36) President.

The presidential visit apart, Guéhenno's early memories of Fougères, as recalled in his works, are dominated by the contrasting figures of his parents. This is to be expected in an only child, but in Guéhenno's case it is also a consequence of the fact, that from a very early age he was obliged to help his mother and father with their work. "A dix ans j'étais un apprenti assez habile pour qu'on ne me laissât presque plus le temps de jouer" (J.40. p.66).

There is no doubt that the influence of Jean-Marie on his son, far outweighed that of Angélique, and that this is despite the fact that Jean-Marie's activities in the working men's movement had direct as well as tragic consequences for the entire family. This is evident from Jean Guéhenno's account of his father, given in Changer la vie. Having experienced poverty and injustice as a child, Jean-Marie rebelled against it: "sa mère faisait des ménages, et les bourgeoises l'éreintaient et la payaient mal, et cela ne lui avait pas semblé juste" (C.V. p.43). The struggle for justice therefore became the basis of his subsequent activity. "Il avait cru voir que la justice était rare... et qu'elle ne se rencontrait que là où l'intelligence,

la volonté et l'honneur de quelques hommes finissaient par l'imposer" (C.V. p.43). Jean Marie's rebellion was at root an individual gesture of defiance, and it did not lead him to any particular ideology, "il n'avait pas fait...de grandes réflexions, n'avait construit aucun système"(C.V. p.43). His taste for the unusual: "il aimait d'instinct tout ce qui était rare et se méfiait du commun" (C.V. p.42), was clearly a reaction to the mediocrity which poverty imposes. Even his hen house demonstrated this defiance: "ce n'était pas un poulailler vulgaire... mais une sorte de palais grillagé" (C.V. p.41). Obviously such individual gestures had little significance in practical terms, a fact Jean-Marie was fully aware of: "Devant le patron, l'ouvrier seul est facilement terrorisé...il faut que l'ouvrier, justement, ne soit pas seul. C'est ce qu'a compris Jean-Marie" (37). Consequently he became deeply involved in political agitation for the workers' cause. In June 1889 he was the first worker to be elected to the Conseil municipal of Fougères, an office to which he was later re-elected, in the years 1891, 1892, 1896, and 1900 (38). He was also active as a Compagnon de la Tour de France, being elected Compagnon Cordonnier-bottier in Fougères, on the 16th October 1895 (39). The compagnonage was a craft guild which admitted only the best craftsmen as members at special initiation ceremonies, although in Fougères an interest in social justice dominated its meetings (40). This was at least in part because the meetings were held in the Guéhenno's room in the rue du Rillé. Jean Guéhenno recalls some of those who attended, all of whom had pseudonyms:

"M. Foursac était Villefranche la Liberté,
Frédéric Paulhan, Montpellier la Franchise,
le père Vaillant, Paris la Probité, le petit
Chéhanne, Louvigné l'Espérance, Jean Bouché,
Dax la Loyauté, François Blanzat, Limoges
l'Amitié" (C.V. p.59).

Jean-Marie Guéhenno was known appropriately as Pontivy la Justice(41), and he particularly admired Monsieur Foursac because "il était le plus cultivé, avait plus lu que tous les autres" (C.V. p.59).

Nevertheless the discussions of the Compagnons were practical rather than philosophical: "On ne mettait pas en pièces l'univers, non, ce n'étaient que...des petites histoires de sous et de centimes encore" (C.V. p.60). As an organisation, the compagnonage "tombait... partout en désuétude, mais il s'était maintenu, on ne sait comment à Fougères" (C.V. p.58). Nonetheless it could no longer satisfy the aspirations of the workers, or even of Jean-Marie himself. This is why he turned his attention to the organisation of a mass movement: "il était de ceux qui, à Fougères, ont fondé l'un des premiers syndicats" (42). Jean Guéhenno believes that Jean-Marie's success in the working mens' movement owed much to his obvious personal qualities: "(il) savait si bien espérer...entraînait gentiment dans la pensée des autres...était né libre...traitait chacun selon son honneur...(et) aimait d'instinct l'éloquence comme le moyen du plus noble échange" (C.V. p.6) (43). At the same time, however, the social conditions in Fougères in the 1890's clearly favoured Jean-Marie's activities, because "La vie, pour les ouvriers, est devenue de plus en plus dure" (44). This was due to increased competition and the resulting cut in wages, although the practice of making workers redundant during periods of low demand, had an even more dramatic effect on people's lives (45). A further

cause of unrest among the workers, and one mentioned by Guéhenno, was the growing demand for consumer products:

"...vers 1900, le monde vraiment avait été pris d'une sorte de frénésie...Les hommes et les femmes d'Europe, tout particulièrement, et chez les pauvres comme chez les riches, avaient conçu une nouvelle prétention. Ils voulurent chaque année changer de peau" (C.V. p.45).

Nonetheless in Jean-Marie's case, involvement in the working mens' movement meant much more than a desire to improve material living standards. He was undoubtedly an idealist, who "n'avait point de haine"(C.V. p.57), and denied that incentives were the sole reason for progress: "ceux qui tiennent la carotte déclarent que sans elle personne ne pourrait plus avancer. Ils mentent" (C.V. p.65). Such idealism, faithfully recounted by his son in Changer la vie explains why Jean-Marie, despite being a major figure in Fougère's working mens' movement, was also politically naïve. Alain Decaux draws attention to the fact that this idealism sometimes led him astray:

"Un révolutionnaire? Pas du tout. Il a même cru au brave général Boulanger. Mais il est républicain, en temps où la République est encore mise en cause par beaucoup d'adversaires. En un temps où le mot seul de République est synonyme de progrès" (46).

This support of Boulanger later became a source of embarrassment for Jean-Marie, but he remained "peu intéressé...par le détail de la bagarre politique quotidienne" (C.V. p.58).

Although inspired by high ideals, Jean-Marie's activity resulted in hardship for his family, and on at least one occasion this led to a dramatic confrontation with his wife. Angélique spent her entire life working on her machine (47), and this ensured that the family did not suffer excessively when

Jean-Marie was out of work. When bronchitis prevented her from working (48) however, the family was reduced to living off Jean-Marie's earnings. In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Jean Guéhenno describes what happened when "par surcroît de malheur...une grève éclatât dans l'usine où travaillait mon père" (J.40. p.73). The family's plight having become critical, Angélique rose from her bed and tried to walk to the factory. She fell on the way, and was brought home by her son, who had followed her on this suicidal journal (49). This in turn obliged Jean-Marie to find work, become a strike breaker, and face the anger of his workmates, who accused him of betraying their common cause. He never forgot the visit they paid him (50), hence "bien des années plus tard, quand ma mère et lui disputaient ensemble, c'était toujours là ce qu'il lui reprochait: "À cause de toi... j'ai été appelé lâche"" (J.40. p.78). Some idea of the family's poverty at this time is provided by the Christmas presents the eight-year old Jean received. They amounted to some chocolates which he had to share, and an orange which was so precious that it was never eaten (51). This orange was to take on a symbolic meaning: "il m'arrive encore de songer au bonheur comme à une belle orange de Noël qu'il faudrait partager entre tous les hommes pour que réellement ils la mangent" (C.V. p.89).

A marked if short-lived change in the family's fortunes did not take place until Jean-Marie left his trade, and became instead a commercial traveller (52). This took place around 1909, when Jean remembers a family day-trip to the seaside at Saint-Mâlo, the expense of which made it "une vraie folie" (C.V. p.90) for the time. The Guéhenno's now lived in relative security and had

high hopes for the future (53). Jean-Marie managed to save enough money to buy a garden (54), an investment made possible by the income provided by the café, which he ran with his wife (55). The café became a focus for the compagnons, whose annual initiation ceremonies were held there (56), and it gave Jean an opportunity to meet a large number of people, some of whom made a lasting impression on him. In later years he recalls Adrienne, the beautiful mistress of a junior officer who he accompanied on a trip to the Mont-Saint-Michel (57), the disputes between the blind man and the disfigured mason who competed for alms (58), but most importantly Buré, a revolutionary who preached the revolution as a gospel (59). In the Journal d'une "Révolution" of 1939, when Guéhenno re-evaluates his inter-war ideas and actions, he claims that "c'est lui (Buré) qui définitivement régla la pente de mes idées" (J.R. p.29). Buré first introduced Jean Guéhenno to the concept of revolution: "un mot revenait toujours dans les propos de Buré: "Révolution"" (C.V. p.99), and taught him to feel contempt rather than admiration for a rich young man who drove his carriage around Fougères to provoke the workers. It is doubtful however, if Buré's teachings made an immediate impact on Jean, because he recalls the admiration he felt for two other customers. The Marquis de Tréogate and his daughter were both poor, but nevertheless refused to work. Unlike Buré, Guéhenno never condemned such people, as he was convinced that they fulfilled a necessary social function, because their example demonstrated the nobility of human existence(60).

It was in the café that Guéhenno became aware that there was more to life than work. "La première révélation que j'eus qu'il y a vraiment un autre monde, je pense bien l'avoir due à la musique,

je veux dire aux chansons...on saisisait toute occasion de chanter" (C.V. p.103). The first flight of an aeroplane built by his friend's father Rivet, a mechanic at Singer's, also made a considerable impression on Guéhenno (61): "je ne puis dire ce que fut cette marche triomphale et comme nous étions émus" (C.V. p.102). The event captured the imagination of a boy who, although he now had plenty of opportunity to meet people and make new friends in his parents' café, preferred to day-dream (62). This behaviour worried Angélique, but Jean-Marie took a different view, and sent his son to the Collège de Fougères, despite the considerable expense that this involved (63). The family's financial resources now permitted this expenditure, whilst the awareness that his parents were paying for his studies, ensured that Jean took them seriously: "Tout ce que j'entendais autour de moi me donnait...à penser... que je servais une cause et que j'avais le devoir d'être le premier" (C.V. p.114). Regarded by his classmates as a "bûcheur" (C.V. p.114), Guéhenno's reward came on prize-giving day, which for his mother was "un jour de triomphe. Ce jour-là, elle mettait un chapeau, comme une dame, pour m'accompagner" (C.V. p.115). This was also the only day Guéhenno himself recalls with satisfaction. His three years (64) at the Collège de Fougères were unhappy ones, as his classmates were sons of the local petit-bourgeoisie, before whom he felt "(sa) roture et (son) indignité" (C.V. p.114). For the first time he identified himself with Caliban, because like Caliban he was the lowest of the low in his world. In Changer la vie he claims that "ce n'est pas hasard, si je me suis risqué une fois à faire tout un livre des grognements de ce pauvre Caliban. J'ai très bien su, tout jeune, comment il grogne et ce qu'est sentir

peser sur soi le mépris" (C.V. p.114). When in 1928 Guéhenno published Caliban parle, what he presents is the dilemma of a Caliban who is thirsty for knowledge, thereby drawing on his own experiences at the Collège de Fougères.

Despite all the hard work and the prizes which it won him, Guéhenno's real academic achievement was minimal, given the poor teaching standards at the Collège de Fougères. This became painfully obvious, when in 1904, fourteen-year old Guéhenno took and failed the internal scholarship examination (65). In normal circumstances he would not even have taken this examination, as the Collège fees did not represent an undue burden on his parents' financial resources. Unfortunately however, in the summer of 1904, his father succumbed to a long and ultimately terminal illness (66). The result of this was financial hardship for all the family, but for Jean it meant that securing a scholarship represented his only chance of continuing his studies. Although Jean-Marie tried to save the family's money, when he made a false sale of his property to his sister (67), thanks to which sale he was able to receive free hospital treatment, he could no longer pay for his son's fees. Jean was therefore obliged to leave the Collège and seek employment. He recalls this as a traumatic experience: "cette crise de mon enfance a...déterminé toute ma vie... L'interdiction que je subis augmenta mon désir jusqu'à la passion...j'attribuai, dès ce moment à la vie de l'esprit une importance peut-être exagérée" (C.V. p.116). Guéhenno's life-long pre-occupation with culture, has its origins here, in the summer of 1904. His distress was made worse by the knowledge that his classmates, who were no better than he was "allaient au collège comme va chez un commerçant un client à qui son argent donne droit à quelque marchandise" (C.V. p.116).

Since lack of money alone prevented him from continuing his studies, Guéhenno did not blame himself for his misfortune. Nonetheless his grief was real and inconsolable, because as an atheist he could not turn to religion for comfort. He had already lost his faith at an early age and stopped attending church services at twelve (68), which to him seemed to be a normal part of growing up: "curieusement je ne trouve pas trace en moi des inquiétudes... qu'une éducation religieuse aurait dû y mettre" (C.Q.J.C. p.45). The final break with the Church came when he started work in the factory: "mon père aidant, j'ai vite décidé que l'Église et l'usine avaient partie liée pour nous maintenir dans l'obéissance et dans la soumission" (C.V. p.131). Guéhenno's rejection of religion was clearly due to a personal dislike of obedience and resignation (69), as well as to the influence of Jean-Marie. Although secular moral education was officially compulsory as part of the Collège curriculum, Guéhenno makes no mention of it as an influence on him, and it is likely that no such lessons were given in Fougères, as the subject was largely ignored in Western France (70). There are however striking similarities between the aims of "moral education", and Guéhenno's own views on spirituality. The Kantian influence on the curriculum, maintaining that the will should train itself (71), and the view that the will should obey its own moral law, thereby giving the individual moral autonomy (72), are both concepts present in Guéhenno's mature writing.

From the day in October 1904, when he first entered the Manufacture de chaussures (73), Guéhenno describes his attitude to his work as negative in the extreme. This was only to be expected, since his very presence in the factory, seemed to him to

be a punishment for failure in an examination, which he was forced to take only because he was poor. He felt horror at the servitude the factory imposed (74), and certainly felt no pride in his work. Not surprisingly this attitude soon brought him into conflict with his colleagues: "Je n'étais pas fier de notre métier, comme ils l'étaient, et ils ne me le pardonnaient pas" (C.V. p.129). When in later life Guéhenno emphasises the importance of his factory experience, it is as well to remember however, that by virtue of his collège education, he never worked on the shop floor. Alain Decaux claims that "on fait de lui un garçon de courses d'abord, puis un employé du bureau" (75). The humiliating aspects of this first job are recalled by Guéhenno in Changer la vie. "J'allais payer les fournisseurs de la ville... Certains étaient les pères de mes anciens camarades qui affectaient de ne plus me connaître (C.V. p.122). Working as a typist (76) was no better, as "L'atmosphère du bureau était aigre et pénible" (C.V. p.128). As an office worker Guéhenno suffered the indignities of poverty and low pay, but at the same time knew none of the comradeship which existed on the shop floor. This was the deliberate result of the management's policy of "divide and rule", which sought with some success, to set office workers against each other, and against the shop floor. Consequently "les chaussonniers méprisaient ceux qui ne se salissaient plus les mains" (77). Such antagonism existed despite the fact that office workers were as poorly paid as the shop floor. Guéhenno himself started working on a salary of twenty five francs a month, rising to forty five francs after three and a half years (78). He later describes this salary as totally inadequate, "ce n'était même

pas mon pain" (C.V. p.123).

The most important event witnessed by Guéhenno during his years in the factory, was the strike of 1906-1907 (79), which he recounts in detail in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans and in Changer la vie. In Changer la vie he remembers that "c'était une affaire de pain bien sûr, mais autant une affaire d'honneur, un dur combat" (C.V. p.148). The bitterness and length of this strike gave it national importance (80), and for a time focussed socialist attention on Fougères. The strike itself began as a lock-out designed to break the power of the unions, whilst at the same time cutting wages. The aim of this lock-out was also to increase the power of the "syndicat jaune", which was created by the factory owners, and which was supported by the most docile workers, who were those who had recently moved to Fougères from the villages. Timed to coincide with the period of greatest demand for work, the lock-out involved all the town's factories, and it began when the unions in one factory rejected an ultimatum to accept lower wages. Strictly speaking the lock-out never materialised, as the unions called a strike in protest at the threat of one.

" La vraie question était pout le syndicat patronal de briser (la) force ouvrière qui commençait de monter. La grande masse des familles, après quelques semaines, fut absolument sans moyens de vie, et ce fut une cruelle guerre civile" (C.V. p.151).

After the failure of arbitration by the Chambre de commerce and the Mayor's office, famine became a reality. On the 9th December 1906, the first train load of children from Fougères, left to stay with militant families in Rennes, Paris, Laval and Saint-Nazaire. A month later, with fighting between the "rouges" and the "jaunes"

on the increase, the factory owners decided to re-open their premises. Intervention by the government in Paris resulted in 400 gendarmes being sent to Fougères. This was seen as an act of provocation on the part of Clemenceau and Viviani, and as such drew protests from socialist deputies, as well as inflaming the situation in the town itself. On the 9th January 1907, only 753 workers returned to work under heavy guard. The following day intimidation reduced the figure to 300, which persuaded the factory owners that a return to work was not going to take place. The strike finally ended when on Clemenceau's intervention a commission of the Chambre des députés proposed an agreement which both unions involved in the dispute accepted. This was on the 17th January, but talks with the employers lasted another two weeks, during which violence flared. The most serious disturbances occurred on the 10th of February when Morice, a member of the "syndicat rouge", was killed by a shot from a revolver. Nevertheless the following day, ninety-eight days after it began, the strike in Fougères finally ended (81).

Guéhenno's personal reaction to the strike was one of sympathy and humanitarian concern. Despite being "de toute son âme avec les grévistes" (C.V. p.159), he also admired the courage of the strike-breakers (82), and even had a measure of understanding for the employers: "les chefs d'aucun des deux partis n'étaient des hommes mauvais" (C.V. p.151). Such magnanimity is doubtless due to his not being directly affected by the strike. As an office worker, Guéhenno worked throughout the winter (82), so his memories of it are dispassionate, with the single exception of Jaurès' speech - an event he witnessed personally (84). The very presence of this

man in Fougères testified to the national importance of the strike, as well as giving hope to the strikers, who turned out in force to greet him at the railway station: "tout la ville était là. Parce que tout la ville travaillait pour la chaussure" (85). Jaurès' speech under the Marché couvert made a big impact on Guéhenno, as he recalls it in detail many years later in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans:

"A peine nous parla-t-il de nos épreuves, mais il nous dit que nous n'avions pas le droit d'être vaincus parce que notre combat n'était pas le notre seulement...Et puis sa voix se fit plus grave: il évoqua tous les malheurs que subissaient dans ce moment les hommes, les terres ensanglantées, la guerre qui...montait sur l'horizon...un univers furieux que, seuls, pouvaient exorciser notre bon sens et notre volonté. Alors seulement, vers la fin de son discours, il nous nomma de ce nom plus chargé de tendresse: "camarades", et pour la première fois j'eus le pressentiment de notre vrai destin" (J.40. p.118).

Guéhenno was always proud to acknowledge his debt to Jaurès, a fact François Mauriac remembered well:

"Je n'oublierai jamais...ce que Guéhenno m'a dit - comment ouvrier insignifiant d'une ville bretonne en grève, il s'est passé des heures dressé contre les colonnes du marché où Jaurès allait parler...et tout ce qu'il a trouvé en cet homme: la foi en la mission du peuple...la confiance en la vie..., une lumière qui le guide toujours" (86).

With hindsight there is little doubt that Guéhenno's presence at Jaurès' speech constitutes a major event in his political education. "Tout au long de sa vie, Jean Guéhenno pensera à Jaurès, il y pensera "comme à aucun autre homme"" (87). Although it is always difficult to establish direct influences, it cannot be denied that many of Jaurès' ideas, particularly those on

education, socialism, and spirituality, figure prominently in Guéhenno's mature works beginning with L'Évangile éternel and Caliban parle. As a moralist, Jaurès was concerned by what Harvey Goldberg terms the "debasement of modern society, where men were...depersonalised by the industrial system" (88). He was moreover convinced that the remedy was to be found in socialism, that is in French socialism. Although Jaurès accepted Marx's critique of capitalist production (89), the surplus value theory, the concept of capital concentration and the view of the inevitability of capitalist downfall (90), he rejected class struggle as well as determinism (91). His real roots lay in the traditions of the French Revolution (92), a history of which he edited (93), and in the eighteenth century Enlightenment (94). Determined to ensure that socialism and democracy would not destroy the individual (95), Jaurès proposed a form of socialism which, as understood by Goldberg, "sought to develop all the faculties of man, his power to think, to love and to will" (96). This concern with the spiritual improvement of the individual, led Jaurès to take an interest in culture and education. He supported subsidising the theatre, because for him "socialism was to serve cultural as well as economic needs" (97), and he brought education into the socialist debate. Jaurès called for an education which would be "a constant pursuit of truth...(and) which would make men masters of their environment" (98). It is because Jaurès was concerned with spiritual as well as economic improvements, that in 1898 he gave his support to the *Universités populaires*, in the fervent hope that they "would create a thoughtful proletariat" (99).

In the years before 1914, what Jaurès represented above all else, was the French socialist dream, and this unique heritage is outlined by Alain Decaux:

"La gauche française...a sa propre hérédité... Il semble que l'individualisme français se soit confirmé jusque dans les rassemblements qu'elle provoque. Rousseau à l'origine, et puis Hugo, et puis Michelet, et aussi Proudhon et aussi Blanqui, et enfin Jaurès: on découvre dans cette lignée cet appel venu des profondeurs, cet élan vers l'idéal et parfois vers l'impossible, cette sorte de lumière enfin qui n'appartient qu'à la France" (100).

What Jaurès proposed was an end to inequality and the worst abuses. At the same time he affirmed the right to be sick or old, and most importantly the right to peace.

"Allors, des millions de Français ont rêvé à ces républiques idéales que peignait Jaurès... Dans cette perspective, le rêve socialiste d'avant 1914 nous apparaît comme le plus pur de tous les rêves"(101).

It is a symbol of the pre 1914 socialist dream, that Jaurès appealed to Guéhenno, whom Alain Decaux correctly describes as "l'un de ceux qui révèrent" (102). The combination of individualism and social justice was especially attractive to him, and he made the Jaurèsian dream his own. In the years after 1914, when most abandoned this dream, Guéhenno remained faithful to it, which explains why he did not join any political grouping. Alain Decaux's analysis of his reason for not doing so is particularly perceptive:

"c'est la gauche qu'il allait rejoindre...mais pas un parti de gauche. Jamais Jean Guéhenno n'a adhéré à un parti. Il en fuyait les structures et les consignes. Il se refusait à obéir à des mots d'ordre...un homme libre: voilà ce qu'il a voulu être" (103).

Finally it is also worth noting the parallels between Jaurès' early career and that of Guéhenno. Like Guéhenno Jaurès loved to learn, studying at a Collège (104) and at a Parisian Lycée before entering the École Normale Supérieure (105).

Even though Jaurèsian ideas were to have a major influence on Guéhenno, in 1907 he was politically unaware, and indeed it would not be unfair to suggest that at this time, his only concern was for himself. This is not however, a criticism of Guéhenno, as the unfriendly atmosphere of the office and the need to earn more money, obliged him to be self-reliant. An appeal to his employer for an increase in salary, was a personal initiative which ended in failure and humiliation (106). Nevertheless it convinced Guéhenno, that his future lay outside the factory, and from this moment on he rebelled against factory life. He had already sought to escape from it by enrolling for an evening course in "dessin appliqué" (107), and becoming a friend of the teacher M. Duval (108). Then one night in January 1905 (109), although he had never previously read for pleasure (110), he turned to books in a reaction against the dullness of office work (111). Guéhenno's maternal grandmother was a great help to him, as he recalls later in Changer la vie: "(elle) était marchande de bric-à-brac...Ce fut une grande ressource. Je grappillai chez-elle tout ce que je pus...tout m'était bon" (C.V. p.164). Even though initially Guéhenno's reading was indiscriminate, he soon realised that he needed to direct it towards a concrete goal, the baccalauréat, "Je décidai que le monde était injuste...et puisque ceux qui le menaient étaient bacheliers, que je serais bachelier comme eux, pour travailler à le changer" (C.D.V.E. p.198).

Alain Decaux recalls how Guéhenno tried to inspire himself, by writing on his table at home "Vive le bachot!" (112). Inspiration was sorely needed, given that he prepared for this examination at night and alone (113), helped only by his one remaining collègue friend: "le fils d'un professeur de physique (qui)...me guidait de loin, me proposait et me corrigeait des problèmes" (C.V. p.135). Guéhenno chose the easiest baccalauréat, the "section moderne" (114), but even this placed considerable demands on his time. He therefore resorted to reading in secret, when there was little pressure of work at the office. He recalls the day his superior caught him in Changer la vie:

"Un jour que le travail ne pressait pas au bureau, je m'étais caché à la cave et je lisais je ne sais quoi. Le patron se trouva avoir besoin d'un échantillon de talon et me découvrit assez confortablement assis sur un sac...J'expliquai franchement mon affaire...mon patron était un ancien professeur. Il fut intéressé par mon entreprise... Il me dit que désormais je n'avais plus à me cacher. À la condition que mon travail soit bien à jour...je pourrais lire librement... chaque fois que le train du bureau me laisserait quelque loisir" (C.V. p.145).

Guéhenno's ambition to become a "bachelier" did little to endear him to his already hostile colleagues. A notable tormentor was père Jean, who ironically was also "le seul (qui) approuva (son) entreprise" (C.V. p.132). He constantly asked Guéhenno general knowledge questions and embarrassed him by emphasising his (Guéhenno's) inexperience in love. Many years later Guéhenno could still recall the reactions this provoked among his other colleagues; "(ils) riaient à se tenir le ventre. J'étais sottement malheureux et furieux" (C.V. p.133). Even more painful for him, was his mother's opposition to his studies. With hindsight Guéhenno

acknowledges that "elle devinait que j'étais en train de lui échapper et pleurait" (C.V. p.135). Such a reaction was entirely justified, since in 1895 the chairman of the Parliamentary Enquiry into education stated categorically, that "the purpose of secondary education is to create a ruling élite" (115). The continuing illness of Jean-Marie did nothing to brighten the family atmosphere, but Jean Guéhenno was too preoccupied with his studies to notice this. As an old man, he honestly admits that:

"J'étais ivre de ma propre volonté, ivre aussi de solitude et fier. Il me semblait me battre contre l'univers. Mon père était malade, mais je n'ai gardé de sa maladie presque aucun souvenir. Je faisais un assez joli monstre, tout à moi-même, rien qu'à moi-même" (C.V. p. 135).

Such dedication was finally rewarded in October 1906, when Guéhenno took and passed the first part of the baccalauréat (116). The winter strike of 1906-1907 gave him three months to prepare the second part (117), which he passed easily in July 1907 (118) in Rennes (119). Success in the baccalauréat was a major achievement for Guéhenno, because as he himself says: "c'était alors en France, la première condition de toute carrière libérale" (C.V. p.146). It is worth remembering that even thirteen years later, of the 500,000 pupils leaving school that year, only 10,000 (2%) passed the baccalauréat (120).

Being a "bachelier" did not lead to an immediate change in Guéhenno's life. He remained in the factory for a full year after passing his examination (121), before he obtained a bourse for the Khâgne of the Lycée de Rennes (122). He commenced his studies there in October 1908, as a student of "Rhétorique supérieure" (123). Despite the fact that he passed a science-orientated baccalauréat (124),

which being the easiest had little prestige (125), Guéhenno's teachers decided he was more gifted in the arts, and this is why he was enrolled in the "Rhétorique supérieure" class preparing for the École Normale Supérieure (126). The choice was unusual, if only because he knew neither Latin nor Greek (127).

Guéhenno spent two years at Rennes, years which were in marked contrast to his factory years, because for the first time since Peñné, he now lived a comfortable life. Being part of the small academic élite which attended a Lycée (128), was not without material benefits. For Guéhenno, "cette vie de pensionnaire où je trouvais la table mise, mon lit fait...un garçon à gilet rayé qui me cirait mes chaussures...me remplit d'abord d'étonnement" (C.V. p.174). The surprise was a pleasant one however, and he was particularly pleased to find his fellow students as friendly and welcoming as his surroundings: "j'avais d'excellents camarades" (C.V. p.172). His closest friend at the Lycée de Rennes was Lhostis, like himself a boursier, a Breton and of humble origins (129). With Lhostis, Guéhenno held unnumerable conversations on religious matters (130), Lhostis being a believer, although they never reached any degree of agreement (131). Lhostis left the Lycée prematurely, and died of tuberculosis soon afterwards. Guéhenno recalls two other student friends; a poet who introduced him to Laforgue, Verlaine, as well as to Henri de Régnier, and a student who loved to play the violin (132). Whilst in Rennes, Guéhenno also maintained a close relationship with his long standing friend from the Collège de Fougères, who was studying at the Académie de Rennes (133); "il avait en ville une chambre où il me recevait...Il savait tout de ma jeunesse...je n'avais

rien à lui cacher, et dans sa chambre je respirais à l'aise" (C.V. p.129). Being a promising student, Guéhenno was given the opportunity to study English at a summer school organised by the University of Cambridge, in the summer of 1909. He evidently found the course profitable, as he attained a reasonable command of the language (134). Literature, however became his major interest at Rennes, and it is at this time that he discovered the work of Chateaubriand. He recalls that:

"j'ai visité tous les lieux où il a vécu en Bretagne...c'est le premier nom d'artiste que j'ai entendu nommer et qui m'ait donné à rêver d'une autre condition que la mienne, et quand, vers mes dix-huit ans, je lus René, il me sembla pour la première fois entendre chanter notre langue" (C.V. pp.113-114).

Although life in Rennes was comfortable for Guéhenno, the contrast between his life as a "khâgneux" and that of his mother, led to a feeling of unease, especially at meal times; "quand... nous nous mettions à table, je revoyais soudain ma mère, mangeant... sur le tablier même de sa machine...Alors j'avais un peu honte" (C.V. p.175). With his father dying in hospital, his mother was obliged to return to her sewing machine, but Guéhenno himself was powerless to help her. Jean-Marie's illness was a further reason for the guilt which his son felt about his personal well being. Whereas in Fougères Guéhenno hardly noticed this illness, the year his father spent in the hospital in Rennes made a strong impression on him. He claims that "tous les dimanches et tous les jeudis, sans en rien dire à personne, j'allais le voir aux heures de visite. Je me souviens de ces visites avec une sorte d'horreur" (C.V. p.177).

A further problem for Guéhenno, arose from the fact that even though the social environment at the Lycée de Rennes was pleasant, the academic standards were totally inadequate, with the result that in July 1910 he failed the entrance examination for the École Normale. For the second time in his life, poor teaching had led to his failing an important examination (135). In later years he acknowledges that he was himself partly to blame for this failure: "habitué à travailler seul, j'eus la plus grande peine à m'habituer au travail régulier d'une classe" (C.V. p.180). Nevertheless he did not believe that this was a contributory factor, whilst he was in Rennes.

Eager to escape the difficulties surrounding him, Guéhenno spent the summer of 1910 in the villa of the "belle époque" painter Paul Gervais, on the Côte d'Azur in Agay (136), near St. Raphael (137). Officially he was there as tutor (138) to Gervais' son Albert, but the months he spent in the beach-side villa, were more like a holiday than a job, and he enjoyed himself enormously (139). The "preceptorat" enabled him to save some money, and he also had the opportunity to visit an old cousin in Nice (140).

Since Guéhenno's "bourse" at the Lycée de Rennes was valid for three years, he was expected to return there in October 1910, to resit his École Normale examination. His own view however, was that he should take the "licence de philosophie". He passed this examination with ease, in October and November 1910, and was awarded the Diplôme de licencié ès lettres at the Faculté des lettres de Rennes, on the 8th November 1910 (141). Guéhenno achieved this success despite the fact that his father was close to death, and unconscious when he last saw him, which was between

the written and oral examinations (142). Jean-Marie Guéhenno died in October 1910, at the Hôpital de Fougères (143). Alain Decaux finds no trace of any public interest in the death: "Dois-je vous dire que l'événement ne fait aucun bruit dans le monde, pas même à Fougères?... Mais pour Jean, il s'agit d'une blessure profonde, dont il ne guérira jamais" (144). As a tribute to the memory of his father, Jean, hitherto known as Marcel, officially changed his name to Jean Guéhenno (145). Bitterness at his father's death did little to improve his relations with the authorities at the Lycée de Rennes. Convinced as he was that the Lycée could never prepare him for the École Normale, and unable to persuade his principal to allow him to transfer his "bourse" to a Parisian Lycée, Guéhenno decided to leave soon after receiving his Diplôme de licencié (146).

When he arrived in Paris in early December 1910, he was immediately faced with two major problems: He had hardly any money, and furthermore it was so late in the academic year, that there were no places available in the Lycées (147). Although his prospects looked bleak, Guéhenno turned to Paul Gervais for help. This was a wise decision, as Gervais went to considerable lengths to help him. He offered Guéhenno accommodation at his villa in Neuilly, and then asked his friend, the future Prime Minister Gaston Doumergue (148), to use his influence as a minister, to find a place in a Lycée for him (149). The efforts made by Doumergue soon brought results. Guéhenno entered the khâgne of the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, in January 1911 (150), for which purposes he was given a scholarship (151). His first class tests were unremarkable, but the brief period at Louis-le-Grand was clearly beneficial to him, as he passed his examination for the École Normale with 100% marks in the French oral (152), and entered

the École Normale Supérieure in the rue d'Ulm in October 1911, becoming part of the "Promotion" of that year (153).

The École Normale Supérieure was undoubtedly an élite establishment (154), and its graduates included such major figures as Léon Blum, Jean Jaurès, Charles Péguy, Romain Rolland, Jules Romains, and Jean Giraudoux (155). Nevertheless the École Normale differed from the other Grandes Écoles by virtue of its social make-up, and also by the informal relationships which it allowed between students and teachers (156). Being an institution devoted to the training of teachers for higher education (157), it was at the turn of the century one of the few educational establishments, which offered a full grant to 80-90% of its students (158). Consequently the École Normale was particularly attractive to students of poor origins (159), which is why it was also a potentially fruitful ground for left-wing agitation. This latter fact was soon noticed by Lucien Herr, a thirty year old graduate born in Alsace (160), who became a major political influence on the students (161), after being appointed librarian in 1886 (162). Apparently marked out for a brilliant career, Herr surprised everyone by taking such an insignificant post, but in the words of Daniel Halévy:

"il l'avait désiré...Immuablement assis devant sa lourde table il regardait passer (les) jeunes hommes... Il les fournissait de lectures, leur communiquait un immense savoir...Lucien Herr était né pour le service d'une église et la propagation d'une foi, il aurait pu être catholique: il l'était d'ailleurs, par l'origine...Mais il avait radicalement cessé de l'être...il s'était inscrit...dans le parti socialiste" (163).

Herr appreciated the fact that as librarian at the École Normale, he was well placed to make converts to socialism among the future elite (164), and with the help of his friend Jaurès he was able to put pressure on the students to support the Socialist cause (165).

An indication of the extent of Herr's influence was provided by the behaviour of The École's students during the Dreyfus Affair, when almost all joined the Dreyfusards (166). Clearly Herr's ability to propagate his ideas depended on the fact that at the École Normale a wide cross-section of political beliefs was tolerated in both pupils and teachers (167), but the remarkable personal qualities of the man himself cannot be ignored. The École Normale was certainly a unique institution, and it preserved its special features even after it lost its autonomy, by becoming part of the University of Paris in 1903 (168). Despite the hostility of the other faculties, which resented the École Normale for creaming off the best students, as well as for spreading socialism (169), it continued to produce exceptional graduates. Paul Nizan, Jean-Paul Sartre and Jean Guéhenno, all studied there after the amalgamation of 1903.

Guéhenno's own recollections of the École Normale in the years 1911-1914, particularly in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, give some idea of the atmosphere there at that time. He claims that the recent liberal reforms of the institution "ne l'avaient guère transformée" (J. 40. p.121). Even though "les nouveaux décrets nous avaient accordé une absolue liberté, nous n'en profitons guère" (J.40. p.122). The dominant new idea was, for Guéhenno, the generation gap: "une notion qui, jusque-là, avait eu peu d'usage, l'idée de génération, prit une subite importance" (J.40. p.123). The idea was not without certain consequences:

"peut-être la nouvelle importance que des écrivains avaient donné à l'idée de génération avait-elle eu cet effet de resserrer les liens entre les jeunes hommes. (L'amitié) était notre vie même" (J.40. p.131).

Guéhenno recalls a certain restlessness (170), which manifested itself in illicit sorties to nearby cafés: "par deux, par trois, en blouse, et en pantoufles, quand nous avons assez des livres... Nous allions jusqu'au boulevard Saint-Michel, chez Biard, ou rue Saint-Jaques, chez Facqueur" (J.40. pp.122-123). Significantly however, he recalls no premonitions of war (171). What he remembers instead is the literary taste at the École Normale, which he fully shared.

"Nous avons lu Anatole France, et c'est lui qui, en nous formant à la critique, nous empêcha d'être bêtes, mais sa tranquille sagesse ne remplissait pas notre coeur. Nous entendions d'autres appels. Si Romain Rolland, Jaurès, nous parlaient d'une vie héroïque, Barrès, Gide, d'une vie pathétique, Nietzsche d'une vie dangereuse, il nous semblait toujours que ce fût la même leçon. La question était "d'avoir de l'âme", comme disait M. Barrès" (J.40. p.127).

Of equal importance to these major figures, were lesser known writers like Whitman, Vildrac, Jules Romains, Duhamel and Henri Franck (172), all of whom "augmentaient en nous la conscience de notre bonheur" (J.40. p.132).

Relatively little information exists about what Guéhenno studied at the École Normale, as he himself mentions only his year long obsession with Plato, whom he discovered when he changed the bias of his studies from "philosophie" to "lettres", because he was eager to learn Greek (172). What is much easier to establish however, is what sort of person Guéhenno was, during his years there. His literary tastes suggest that he was not unlike his fellow students. He greatly admired Barrès, whose work seemed to him to be particularly relevant to the youth of 1910 (174).

Guéhenno acknowledges the influence of Barrès' early works: "je pensais lui devoir une vraie gratitude pour certaine leçon de "ferveur", d'anarchie et de liberté que ses premiers livres m'avaient donnée" (L.M.D.A. p.99). At this time he had not yet read Barrès' Les Déracinés, and had only admiration for him (175). Another author much favoured by Guéhenno was André Gide, whose work bore a similarity to the early work of Barrès: "j'avais lu, dès avant la guerre, quand j'étais à l'École Normale, Les Nourritures terrestres. Ils avaient, Barrès et moi, nourri ma "ferveur" (D.L.D.P. p.172). Like his fellow students, Guéhenno identified with the Nathanaël character (176), and he remembers that "toutes (les) maximes... (qui) nous ramenaient à nous-mêmes comme à l'objet les plus précieux nous plaisaient" (J.40. p.129). The most influential of the works he read in this period however (177), was Renan's L'Avenir de la Science, which is very different in spirit to those already mentioned, since its rationalist spirit made it an unusual choice for a man of Guéhenno's generation (178). Nevertheless he claims that "la lecture de L'Avenir de la Science, contribua grandement à changer ma vie" (C.D.V.E. p.69). Moreover "je n'ai plus cessé de le relire" (C.V. p.192). The appeal of Renan was, in part at least, due to Guéhenno's personal association with the places where the author worked: "(Renan) était breton et je l'aimais d'avance...par amour de mon vieux pays. J'habitais alors rue de l'Abbé-de-l'Épée, dans cette même rue où lui-même avait vécu et au même âge" (C.D.V.E. p.156). The influence of Renan is later to be found in Guéhenno's work, notably in Caliban parle and Conversion à l'humain. A general point to note, is that the interest in literature was, in Guéhenno's case, much more than a

fashionable hobby. He had an almost obsessive interest in books well before his arrival at the École Normale, which is why entering the library there was like the realisation of a dream for him:

"j'avais tant rêvé d'une bibliothèque: j'étais au comble de mes vœux" (C.V. p.188). Reading however, soon gave rise to a desire to write. Guéhenno's first literary efforts - pastiches of poems, date from his years at the École Normale: "j'ai su par coeur,... beaucoup de poèmes, de Verlaine et d'Henri de Régnier...et je les imitais sans scrupule" (C.D.V.E. p.116).

Although Guéhenno's taste in literature at the École Normale was not unusual for a man of his generation, the fact remains that it was particularly appropriate to a self-centred person. Social concerns were indeed irrelevant to Guéhenno, whilst he was a "normalien", a fact he frankly acknowledges when as an old man, he writes in La Mort des autres:

"Nous étions ivres de la vie et de nous-mêmes.
Je crains, quant à moi, d'avoir, dans cette
ivresse, passé toutes les limites. J'étais
dans un combat tout personnel...et comme je
l'ai raconté, passionnément occupé de
moi-même" (L.M.D.A. p.24).

Proud of his "déracinement" (179), Guéhenno's only concern was for himself, and it was only after he realised his personal ambitions, that he began to think of the working class he once belonged to (180). As he approached the end of his studies, he first asked himself the question "Pourquoi moi?" (181), and was forced to accept that he was now a member of a privileged elite. Alain Decaux rightly draws attention to the resulting guilt complex: "il était conscient de jouir d'un privilège sans limite. Or par essence, il détestait les privilégiés...Dans ces moments, l'angoisse lui étreignait le

coeur" (182). The guilt complex is important because it lies at the source of many of Guéhenno's subsequent ideas on culture, and as such it is particularly significant with respect to his writing of the 1920's, especially Caliban parle. It would be wrong however, to suggest that at this early stage, he saw it as anything more than a small personal problem of conscience. This is because Guéhenno was too self-involved to appreciate a problem on a non-personal level, and moreover, he was genuinely proud of his achievements. He presented himself as an example to the masses: "Je me définissais la Révolution pour tous les hommes par l'effort que j'avais moi-même accompli" (C.V. p.190). Furthermore he soon overcame his guilt about his personal success, by seeing himself as a representative of the poor at the École Normale (183).

Forgetting the debt he owed to his father, to his friends, and to Paul Gervais, Guéhenno took the view that his success was entirely due to his personal efforts. This belief that he was a self-made man, was to determine his attitude to party politics, and accounts for why he treated Lucien Herr's efforts to recruit him for the "section socialiste", with contempt: "je trouvais ridicule qu'on prétendît m'expliquer...à moi-même... Nous n'en parlâmes plus" (C.V. p.187). This was not however, an altogether unusual reaction, because by the time Guéhenno entered the École Normale, Lucien Herr's influence was very much on the decline (184), and he no longer commanded respect. Guéhenno's own attitude to him was one of resentment rather than admiration: "c'était un homme...autoritaire. Dès qu'il m'entreprit sur la vie ouvrière, j'éprouvai une gêne qui m'ôta tout parole" (C.V. p.187). Guéhenno had far greater admiration for Lucien Herr's assistant Quéré, whose personal efforts had won him promotion from

the kitchen to the library of the École Normale (185). He obviously respected the "self-made man" in Quéré, but the two had considerably more in common than that. He remembers that "(Quéré) était plus breton que moi-même...mais surtout j'étais touché par son amour des livres...Nous étions dans la même passion et la même chance" (C.V. pp.189-190).

However self-involved Guéhenno might have been, he was certainly not a solitary individual, since his fondest memory of the École Normale, is of the large number of good friends he had there. He was especially close to three of his fellow students: Durckheim, Desjardins, and Vaillant (186). Durckheim's ambition to enter a seminary (187) was thwarted when he was killed during the war (188), Jacques Desjardins became an "inspecteur général de l'Instruction publique" (189), whilst André Vaillant remained Guéhenno's friend throughout his life. He later dedicated Jeunesse de la France to him, and often watched television with him, when both of them lived in the same block of flats in the rue Pierre Nicole in Paris (190). Guéhenno recalls three other, more distant friends. One was a Jew, whom he greatly respected because "d'entre nous, il était le plus grave, le plus sage" (J.40. p.133). He also reminded Guéhenno that "ce qui compte, c'est la vérité seule" (J.40. p.134). Guéhenno remembers that

"j'avais, avec mon ami le Juif, d'interminables débats. Je me demandais ce qu'il fût advenu de moi, si, j'étais resté à l'usine...J'aurais été le maître d'une machine...peut-être secrétaire d'un syndicat et j'aurais livré de vraies batailles...Mon ami me répondait...que tout cela n'était que faux remords...que je n'avais pas à me repentir d'être désormais mieux armé pour le service des hommes que j'aimais" (J.40. pp.139-140).

Guéhenno was grateful to this friend, for putting his mind at rest.

Another friend was Marcel Etévé, also a casualty of the war (191) with whom Guéhenno remembers visiting Montmartre: "des matins de printemps...nous montions ensemble...jusqu'au marché de la rue Lepic" (J.40. p.136). Finally, there was Maurice Genevoix, who entered the École Normale in the same year as Guéhenno (192). They became much closer after the war, when they often corresponded and sometimes met in Paris. Maurice Genevoix recalls:

"Nous nous sommes retrouvés, survivants désemparés, et rapprochés d'instinct... Il était professeur à Lille. J'avais opté pour le métier d'écrire et vivais, dans le Val de Loire orléanais...Mais nous nous rejoignons par lettres ... C'était réellement nous rejoindre: nos lettres, pour l'un comme pour l'autre, avaient la spontanéité, le ton d'une voix, la réalité sensible d'une présence..." (193).

Although Guéhenno had a "bourse d'externat" whilst at the École Normale (194), the high rates paid to private tutors persuaded him to take up private teaching: "Je me souviens avec plaisir d'une petite princesse russe ou polonaise, je ne sais plus, à qui j'appris à faire des vers...A vingt francs l'heure"(C.V. p.199). By way of comparison his starting salary at the factory, which covered a whole month, was twenty-six francs. Through his tutoring Guéhenno came into contact with Parisian high-society - an experience he did not relish. He recalls a particularly embarrassing scene which took place in the home of a rich financier: "Il ne convoqua, même m'invita à déjeuner comme un monstre édifiant à présenter à ses enfants...On ne m'avait jamais fait tant d'honneur" (C.V. p.212). This financier did not wish to buy a tutor. His requirements were more subtle - Guéhenno was to serve as an example to his son Alain: "nous voudrions...que vous lui appreniez un peu ce que sont les hommes..." (C.V. p.214). Guéhenno however, refused

to indulge the taste of a rich bourgeois family for second-hand experiences of poverty and hardship: "je ne comprenais rien au façons de ce grand bourgeois libéral. Je sentais de la gêne et de la colère. Je répondis, le plus poliment possible, que le plus intime de moi n'était pas à vendre" (C.V. p.215). He was far happier working for Eugène Brieux, as his secretary: "c'est son exemple sans doute qui me décida à écrire pour les autres. C'était un homme d'une générosité rayonnante. Il m'avait embauché...sur la recommandation de...Paul Gervais...dont l'amitié veillait sur moi" (C.D.V.E. p.116). Brieux was considering writing a play on the theme of jealousy, and needed someone to research the subject, because "il croyait à la science et était préoccupé par les découvertes modernes" (C.D.V.E. p.116). Guéhenno's duties involved reading psychological and physiological treatises on the subject of jealousy. This work was ultimately futile, as Brieux abandoned his project. Nevertheless Brieux remained well-disposed to Guéhenno and later sought his co-operation on a hospital project during the war.

Guéhenno's essentially happy period at the École Normale ended with unexpected disappointment, when in July 1914 an untimely attack of appendicitis caused him to fail the agrégation (195). Guéhenno left the École Normale at the end of the academic year (196), and any thoughts of re-sitting the examination were soon eclipsed by the outbreak of world war in August 1914. The event itself, was however prefigured by a murder which made an equally great impression on Guéhenno - the assassination of Jaurès. He recalls the circumstances in which he learnt of this assassination in La Foi difficile of 1957 (197), and in La Mort des autres of 1968.

In the latter text he describes the evening of the 31st July 1914:

"Il était près de minuit. Nous sortions du Théâtre Français...La guerre, on n'y croyait pas encore, on ne voulait pas y croire. Les vieilles gens en parlaient. Nous, peut-être la menace nous rendait-elle seulement un peu plus fiévreux, un peu plus ardents au plaisir ...Une femme ses jupes envolées autour d'elle, traversait la place...elle cria: "Jaurès est assassiné"...La guerre était là! Le plus humain de tous les hommes vivants devait être sa première victime" (L.M.D.A. pp. 41-42).

Called up immediately after the declaration of war (198), Guéhenno was rejected for active service on grounds of ill health. Nonetheless he insisted that the decision be reversed, so after considerable effort he was finally accepted as a common soldier (199), and sent to a training camp in a town in central France known only as C. (200). There is no doubt that Guéhenno welcomed war in 1914. He himself admits that "le premier août...j'étais prêt...Avec une enfantine frénésie, je jouai et chantai Sambre-et Meuse: "Les fils sont plus grands que les pères" (J.40. p.148). Admittedly he also claimed that he insisted on joining the army out of a feeling of solidarity with his friends, but this is a rationalisation which has no bearing on his emotional response at the time, and was in any case formulated after the war (201). It is possible to speculate about the influence of Péguy's death in September 1914 on Guéhenno. He claims that "je ne crois pas avoir alors rien lu de lui...C'est sa mort, au mois de Septembre, qui me le révéla et l'article de Barrès" (L.M.D.A. p.50). It must be remembered however, that it was not until after the war, that Guéhenno began to read Péguy (202), and moreover he himself believes that "je n'avais avec lui aucune idée commune" (D.L.D.P. p.24) (203).

The generally enthusiastic attitude to war, which Guéhenno admits to displaying in the early days of August, lasted but a few days. An error on the part of the recruiting office, gave him eight days free time in Paris, during which he reflected on the war, and realised that he had doubts about it: "Je me souviens très bien du moment où le doute s'insinua en moi..." (J.40. p.170). These doubts only disappeared once he arrived at training camp:

"mystérieusement je découvrais de nouvelles raisons d'aller me battre" (J.40. p.173). Furthermore "être affecté à un régiment de Touraine me semblait une faveur du ciel" (J.40. p.173).

Although he was eager to fight, Guéhenno was unable to realise his ambition immediately, because soon after his arrival at training camp, he was struck down by illness (204). When he recovered and returned to barracks in October or November 1914 (205), his eagerness to fight was in question "mais je n'avais pas à le vouloir ou ne le vouloir pas. L'ordre viendrait" (J.40. p.176). Disillusion finally came, when he received news of the death of his close friend D. (206). Guéhenno's reaction was one of anger and revolt: "la vie lui avait été volée" (J.40. p.181). The death of his friends was to be a major factor in his final rejection of war:

"Nous étions trente et un camarades dans ma promotion à l'Ecole Normale, trente et un "du même ban" comme eût dit Péguy. Vingt-quatre furent mobilisés. Neuf furent tués, neuf furent blessés. On mesure, quand on a ainsi appartenu à une "fraternité"...de jeunes hommes, ce que fut le malheur..." (L.M.D.A. p.67).

Nevertheless whatever doubts Guéhenno had at this stage, remained as his private thoughts, because he successfully completed his military training and left for the front in the winter of 1914-1915 (207), as

lieutenant (208) in the 77e régiment d'Infanterie (209). He was sent to fight in the sector of the front near Vlamertinghe in Belgium (210), where it appears he spent the whole of his period of active service (211). Guéhenno's record in the trenches was unremarkable (212), and as he later confesses in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, he was like the majority of the survivors, a coward (213). Nonetheless it is as well to remember that his period of active service was so short, that he had little opportunity to excel or to disgrace himself. On the 15th of March 1915 (214) he was hit in the face by a bullet which destroyed the tissues around his right eye (215). There is a certain irony in the fact that Guéhenno, who who had little faith in the war, should have ended his service record as a hero. He was cited for bravery, and received the Croix de Guerre (216).

After a brief stay at a field hospital in a village in Flanders (217), Guéhenno was moved to a hospital in Rouen, where an operation saved the sight of his eye (218). During his convalescence there, he bought and read Martin du Gard's Jean Barois. This was on the 29th March 1915 (219). Jean Barois, written in 1913, was the book which made Martin du Gard's reputation as an author, but its attraction to Guéhenno lay in its treatment of the conflict between science and religion, which overshadows the theme of the Dreyfus Case (220). The reinterpretation of religious dogmas in aesthetic and moral terms (221), was especially relevant to Guéhenno, because as an atheist, he was looking for an ideal to replace religious faith. A further reason for his interest in the book is its portrayal of the 1905 generation, its respect for authority, its cult of spontaneous creation and its enthusiasm

for war (222). The influence of Martin du Gard's ideas on Guéhenno is however much more important. The former's tendency to view political problems in moral terms, evident in the description of the Dreyfus Case in Jean Barois "in terms of an ethical ideal which was later perverted by partisan ends" (223), later characterises Guéhenno's attitude towards political events. Secondly there is a certain ethical nihilism in Martin du Gard, which is frankly acknowledged by him, when he says that outside religious faith there are no grounds for morality (224). Nihilism is also a problem in Guéhenno's work of the late 1930's. When in the last pre-second World War works, Guéhenno's individualism leads him to express near-anarchic viewpoints, André Thérive describes him as "un libertaire pur, un nihiliste qui s'ignore" (225). Finally there is the question of the influence of Martin du Gard as a "herald of engagé literature" (226). Guéhenno became a strong supporter of this literature, and he shared Martin du Gard's view that the individual human personality is linked to the society and history of its time (227). Not without significance is Martin du Gard's preference for Tolstoy rather than Dostoyevsky, and a backward-looking taste for scientific positivism (228). This is because Guéhenno identified with Renan as well as with the rationalist tradition, and later he also showed a serious interest in Tolstoy (229).

When he left hospital in Rouen, Guéhenno declined a second commission in active service (230), although the significance of this gesture is unclear, as he was in any case declared unsuitable for such service (231). His military career now took him to Lyon (232), where he worked as a translator "dans un service de

censure postale qui avait charge de surveiller les échanges entre la Suisse et le monde" (C.D.V.E. p.85). Guéhenno's mental attitude at this time was one of revolt and despair (233): "de chers amis, cet hiver-là, vraiment m'aidèrent à vivre. Focillon, Legrand, et le caporal Zimmermann, professeur à l'Université" (L.M.D.A. p.109). In 1916 through Legrand, Guéhenno first met Jules Romains: "(il) traversa Lyon et nous passâmes ensemble une soirée au cinéma" (D.L.D.P. p.128). Whilst at Lyon, he also made the acquaintance of Jean Giraudoux, whose courage in wearing a monocle he much admired (234). Guéhenno's work in censorship gave him a unique opportunity to formulate a balanced view of war, and it was through his professional duties, that in August 1916 he discovered Rabindranath Tagore's "Message de l'Inde au Japon". He recalls the incident in La Mort des autres:

"J'avais lu et beaucoup admiré son Gitanjali, immédiatement avant la guerre et j'étais heureux de le retrouver. J'appris qu'il avait...parlé comme un prophète...et ce message n'était qu'un fragment d'un livre: Nationalisme...Je ne saurais dire de quel secours elle me fut dans la dernière année de la guerre" (L.M.D.A. p.198).

Whereas the Gitanjali, translated by Gide in 1913 is for Guéhenno "(un) hymne à la vie intérieure" (L.M.D.A. pp. 198-199), Nationalisme has a clear political and social message. It is an attack on the idea of the nation by a great internationalist (235). Guéhenno quotes Tagore's view that "le temps est venu où, pour le salut du monde entier outragé, L'Europe doit reconnaître...l'absurdité terrible de la chose qu'on appelle Nation" (236). He also believes that the book is "(une) condamnation la plus haute qui eût été portée encore de l'égarement de la civilisation occidentale" (C.D.V.E. p.86). Guéhenno later supported Tagore's view that

"la guerre, était le résultat fatal de l'ambitieuse et inhumaine politique de l'Occident, and that une nation...réduit autant qu'elle peut la vie personnelle de l'homme ...Il cesse...d'être une âme vivante" (C.D.V.E. p.86). Furthermore he adds that "j'admiraïs cette dénonciation de la volonté de puissance des Européens" (C.D.V.E. p.87). The condemnation of the nation for its destruction of the individual is extremely important, since both Tagore's and Guéhenno's chief concern is the individual. Tagore proclaims his "faith in the dignity of the individual" (237), and states his belief that "the individual finds fulfilment only when he is autonomous" (238). This faith is clearly present in Guéhenno's major works. Although he judges Tagore to be "un bon témoin et un bon juge de nos désordres" (L.M.D.A. p.199), a view which is supported by Humayun Kabir (239), Guéhenno also makes certain criticisms of him. He regrets Tagore's failure to note the European "volonté de lumière" (C.D.V.E. p.87), and believes Tagore overstates his case. "L'homme n'était pas mort en nous, et nous n'étions pas ces machines dont Tagore parlait" (L.M.D.A. p.201). In general terms however, Guéhenno's view of Tagore conforms with the contemporary Western view of him. Humayun Kabir states that "both during the first World War and in the years immediately thereafter, he (Tagore) was hailed by the West as a seer and sage" (240). This is certainly true of Guéhenno who says of Tagore: "d'une sagesse immémoriale, il dénonçait toutes les causes de nos misères" (J.D.A.N. 9. août 1941. p.173). Finally it is worth noting, that the parallels between Tagore and Guéhenno go beyond the assessment of war. Tagore's concept of the universal man (241), and his rejection of "art for art" (242),

are ideas which preoccupy Guéhenno in his mature works, especially in L'Évangile éternel and Caliban parle.

Even though the influence of Tagore's views on war is important, as are Guéhenno's personal experience of it, he claims that the greatest influence on him was Romain Rolland's Au-dessus de la mêlée, which he read in Lyon during the winter of 1915 (243). Having read Jean-Christophe before the war (244), he was already familiar with Romain Rolland's work, and claims that "en 1915, j'avais estimé comme un grand honneur pour la France que ce fût un Français qui eût...dit, le premier, non à la guerre" (D.L.D.P. p.175). Reading Au-dessus de la mêlée was not a revelation for him, but the impact of this book on Guéhenno was so great, precisely because it supported his own opinions. He recalls how in the midst of nationalist propaganda "ce petit livre disait tout ce qu'on ne devait pas dire et je me sentis enfin autorisé à penser tout ce que je pensais" (L.M.D.A. p.108).

The period Guéhenno spent in Lyon, was one of readjustment to civilian life. During this time he formulated a clear view of the war, and equally importantly, he made a major decision affecting his personal life. On the 17th of April (245), 1916, he married Jeanne Maurel, "une camarade d'études, agrégée d'histoire et de géographie, qu'il a profondément aimée et qui, après la guerre, lui a donné une fille, Louise" (246). Jeanne Maurel came from the Midi, and whilst they were married they often spent their holidays in Montolieu, a village near Carcassonne (247).

Shortly after his marriage Guéhenno left Lyon, at the invitation of his pre-war acquaintance Eugène Brieux. He recalls

this in Carnets du vieil écrivain of 1971:

"Il (Brieux) avait conçu l'idée de fonder, avec des donateurs américains, un hôpital pour les intellectuels qui perdraient leurs yeux à la guerre et qu'il faudrait rééduquer et préparer à de nouveaux métiers. L'école finit par être ouverte à tous les soldats aveugles. Il m'offrit d'en être l'un des administrateurs, et j'ai ainsi vécu pendant trois années entre nos élèves et lui. Notre école était à Neuilly" (C.D.V.E. p.117) (248).

Guéhenno's duties included giving morning lectures to the patients, the purpose of which was "de les forcer à sentir, en dépit de tout, la grandeur de la vie" (C.D.V.E. p.118). Moreover he recalls that on Brieux's instructions

"J'allais...demander à quelque grand personnage de venir parler à l'école...Bergson vint leur dire ce qu'était un philosophe, Viviani ce qu'était un avocat. Le plus brillant et le plus efficace fût sûrement Sacha Guitry qui, pendant deux heures, les fit beaucoup rire" (C.D.V.E. p.118).

This contact with the famous ended when the danger of bombing forced Brieux to move the hospital to the château at La Rochecorbon, near Tours (249). Guéhenno remembers inviting Anatole France to speak at La Rochecorbon in the summer of 1917, because "il était tout près de nous, à la Béchellerie. Il eut peur de l'épreuve" (C.D.V.E.p.118). This visit is mentioned earlier in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, where Anatole France is presented as a sage from an earlier age, who erred in 1914 and was now ashamed of this (250). The real significance of Guéhenno's work at the hospital for his later life and work, does not however, lie in the contacts it afforded him. Instead it is to be found in the effect on him of the hospital environment, Alain Decaux rightly states that "auprès de ces hommes désespérés, (Guéhenno) va avoir tout le temps de méditer sur

l'absurdité de ces désastres (la guerre)". Furthermore, mindful of his own experience, "comme tous ses camarades (Guéhenno) va jurer que l'on ne reverra plus jamais (la guerre)" (251). Guéhenno's later pacifist militancy owes as much to the three years he spent observing the long term suffering caused by war, as it does to his personal experiences at the front.

There is little doubt that the events which occurred in Russia throughout 1917 had an immediate and long-term affect on Guéhenno. Nevertheless his attitude was politically controversial from the outset. In a journal which he kept in February and March of that year, and which he only rediscovered at the time of writing La Mort des autres in 1968, he notes: "Le temps que nous vivons n'est point fait pour les hommes... Mais "cela" se fera! "Cela" viendra!" On the 18th of March he writes: "La révolution russe! Vive la Révolution!" (L.M.D.A. pp.162-163). The critical point here, is that Guéhenno's enthusiasm is for the bourgeois democratic revolution of March (February) 1917, which gave power to the provisional government and the workers' councils, against whose rule Lenin led the October Revolution. This raises the question of Guéhenno's attitude to October 1917 and it also explains certain ambiguities in this attitude. Alain Decaux claims that in 1917 "Guéhenno, comme d'autres, regarde du côté de l'Orient. En octobre 1917, il y a vu s'allumer "un grand feu"" (252). After the Congrès de Tours however, "(il) éprouve de la joie à voir la révolution marxiste triompher en Russie...mais il dit que ...cela ne signifie nullement que les Français, eux, doivent changer de méthode" (253). The problem of Guéhenno's attitude to the Soviets becomes particularly important when he comes to write Journal d'un homme de 40 ans.

Throughout his time at Brioux's hospital, Guéhenno continued to develop his interest in literature. In 1918 American friends introduced him to the work of Walt Whitman (254). Whitman appealed to Guéhenno, because he placed great emphasis on the spiritual life of the individual, but in the light of 1917, Whitman's democratic ideal was equally important to him. Whitman believed that "the inner life is more important than the external one" (255), and therefore made the individual his central preoccupation. The main theme of his principal work Leaves of Grass "is the attempt to answer the question of the self, "identity", what is a person and what is his relation to society" (256). This acknowledgement that society is a major issue for the individual which he must consider, leads Whitman to a discussion of the ideal form society ought to take. His choice is democracy, but for him "democracy is not so much a political system as a "grand experiment" in the development of individuals" (257). Hence Whitman's view of democracy is of "a moral and spiritual ideal - in fact a religion" (258). Democracy is seen as an ideal form of society, principally because it ensures freedom for the individual to progress spiritually. "Out of the American democracy of 1855, Walt Whitman constructed a... spiritual democracy governed by two principles, one the unlimited individual, the other the equality of individuals" (259). This is an ideal which Guéhenno later also finds in Michelet, and makes his own in L'Évangile éternel. During the Occupation he praised Whitman's "ardeur individualiste" and found comfort in his dream of "un nouveau monde où l'individu n'avait plus à se développer contre les autres, mais avec les autres, et saurait qu'il s'enrichit en devenant plus fraternel" (J.D.A.N.29. Oct.1940.pp.62-63).

It is therefore apparent, that when Richard M. Bucke speaks of Leaves of Grass as a "bible of Democracy" (260), he is speaking of a highly individual, spiritual understanding of this concept. Looking forward to Guéhenno's own work, and his use of the first person narrative, it is worth noting that Whitman also uses the first person, and that his use of "'I" is generic and cosmic rather than personal" (261). It is also worth speculating about the possible influence of Léon Bazalgette's Walt Whitman, L'Homme et son Oeuvre - published in 1908, on Guéhenno's view of Whitman. Bazalgette "revived the idealised interpretations of...Bucke with a critical enthusiasm and lack of reserve" (262). In particular he idealises Whitman's apprenticeship years, and asserts "the perfect concordance between the interior Walt and his physical appearance" (263). Such opinions if known, would undoubtedly have increased Guéhenno's interest in Whitman, as they coincide with his reasons for admiring Michelet a few years later. What is certain is that Guéhenno was a good friend of Bazalgette, after Bazalgette read the article he published on Whitman (264). The article entitled "Whitman, Wilson et l'Esprit moderne", appeared in La Revue de Paris on the 1st January 1919, and was his first published work (265).

Seeing his first article in print, encouraged Guéhenno to express his personal views: J'imaginai avoir acquis à la guerre trois nouveaux sens. Je leur avais donné leurs noms. Je les appelais le sens du peuple, le sens du monde, le sens de l'avenir...Je déclamais" (L.M.D.A. p.188). In April, May and June 1919, the Grande Revue published a series of articles by Guéhenno on the three "senses" (266). He claims he was "dans l'ivresse de la

vie retrouvée" (L.M.D.A. p.188), at the time he wrote the three articles, and moreover he expected the world to change (267). The naivety of the articles is not however, their chief interest. What is more striking is Guéhenno's style, which particularly in "le Sens du Peuple" is overloaded with literary references to the extent that the ideas expressed become obscured:

"Quand il eut mis à mort Penthésilée la guerrière, Achille s'aperçut qu'elle était belle et l'aima. Ainsi sommes-nous devant la vie même...Mais toutes nos larmes ne ressusciteront pas le cadavre de la jeunesse" (268).

As a protest against the older generation which sent its sons to war, Guéhenno's series of articles is ineffective because it lacks clarity and simplicity. It does however prefigure the style of the early books, notably that of Caliban parle, in its tendency to discuss contemporary issues in terms of literary anecdotes, or by reference to previous literary treatments of the subject-matter. Whilst at La Rochecorbon, Guéhenno also wrote an article about Rabindranath Tagore (269), and performed his first public act, when he added his signature to Romain Rolland's "Déclaration d'indépendance de l'esprit" (270). He later describes this as "mon premier engagement public" (F.D. p.30.), a gesture made at a time when he believed the world could be changed with "quelques acolytes" (F.D. p.30).

Despite the fact that to all intents and purposes Guéhenno lived the life of a civilian after he was discharged from hospital in Rouen, and expressed his views freely, his official links with the military remained. At La Rochecorbon he was obliged to continue wearing his uniform (271) throughout the three years he worked there. Formal notice of demobilisation did not come until August

1919 (272), when Guéhenno left La Rochecorbon and returned to civilian life.

There is little doubt that by 1919 Guéhenno was a man whose personality and attitudes were already fully developed. He was above all else a self-involved individualist, as the traumatic experiences of the first twenty-nine years of his life had taught him the value of self-reliance. The practical example of his father had shown Guéhenno, that escape from poverty was possible only through personal effort, and upward social mobility. Faced with the possibility of a lifetime in a shoe factory, Guéhenno ignored the taunts of his colleagues, determined to achieve the academic qualifications which would allow him access to higher education, where he could pursue his real interests. The academic progress which took him to the École Normal Supérieure certainly enabled him to change his personal future, and it also served to reinforce his individualism, because learning for Guéhenno was as lonely as well as a highly competitive activity. Finally his experiences in the trenches of the First World War showed him that life itself depended on the ability to resist social pressures. Only by ignoring such pressures and accepting cowardice, was Guéhenno able to survive the war.

Nevertheless the early impression made upon him by his father's idealistic syndicalism, as well as the awareness of his mother's continuing poverty, meant that Guéhenno felt guilty about his personal success, and could not come to terms with his new social position as a bourgeois. Consequently in an attempt to resolve this guilt, he embraced Left-wing ideology. Having seen and been influenced by Jaurès' speech in Fougères, Guéhenno also looked

for political guidance in the works of Romain Rolland and Rabindranath Tagore. When he was finally demobilised, he had already made political choices concerning the twin problems of war and nationalism, which were based on a continued fidelity to Jaurès' pre-1914 socialist dream. At the same time however, Guéhenno's disenchantment with a French State which had permitted the disaster of 1914-1918, meant that he now placed his hope in Russia, welcoming both the revolutions of 1917.

General political ideas apart, Guéhenno's literary tastes were also clearly formed by 1919. At the École Normale he had read and been influenced by the works of Barrès, Gide and Renan, which tended to reinforce his individualism. Nonetheless after the experiences of the trenches, he also read Walt Whitman, where he found not only a concern for the spiritual life of the individual, but also an interest in the problem of how the individual related to society.

With hindsight, it is clear that by 1919 it was possible to envisage Guéhenno writing such works as Caliban parle and Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, because the problems of these works were already his major preoccupations. The individualism moderated by social concern typified Guéhenno's attitude both in 1919, and in his major works of 1927-1938. That Guéhenno changes little after 1919 is not altogether surprising. The major traumas of his life were behind him, and it was now time for him to evaluate his experiences. This he did throughout the inter-war years, beginning with the first articles written for La Revue de Paris and the Grande Revue.

Footnotes to Chapter One

1. Notably in C.V.
2. See: Discours prononcé par Alain Decaux, in Discours prononcés dans la séance publique tenue par l'Académie Française pour la réception de M. Alain Decaux le jeudi 13 mars 1980. Paris, Institut de France, 1980, p.6.
3. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
4. See: J.40.p.59.
5. See: C.V. p.51.
6. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.6.
7. This is stated in the unpublished "Diplôme de Réception de Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Union Compagnonnique des compagnons du Tour de France des devoirs unis, Fougères 16.X.1895, Lyon 14.IX.1905." (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
8. See C.V. p.51.
9. See: *ibid.*, p.52.
10. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.6.
11. See: C.V. p.48.
12. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.6.
13. See: *ibid*, p.6.
14. See: C.V. p.72, where Guéhenno claims that "ils habitaient vers le haut de Rillé, entre les couvents et le vieux château".
15. See: J.40. p.60, where Guéhenno describes his maternal grandfather: "il était boulanger, fort comme un turc et joyeux ivrogne"

16. See: C.V. p.72.
17. See: J.40. p.68.
18. See: *ibid.*, pp.71-72.
19. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
20. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.6. See also: C.V. p.76.
"Un enfant naquit, mourrut en nourrice".
21. See: J.40. p.19, where Guéhenno says: "J'ai lu trop souvent dans leurs yeux l'immense désir qu'ils avaient que je sois heureux d'être là et de vivre".
22. See: *ibid.*, p.19: "M'élever à la maison était impossible. Mes parents travaillaient tout le jour".
23. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.6.
24. See: *ibid.*, p.6. See also: C.V. p.17.
25. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.6.
26. See: C.V. p.17. The title of Chapter Two is "Peïné ou le paradis perdu".
27. See: J.40. p.23.
28. See: C.V. p.17: "Jusque vers ma douzième année je revins toujours à Peïné" See also: Alain Decaux, Discours.... p.6: "Il (Guéhenno) y est retourné, jusqu'à sa quatorzième année pour les grandes vacances".
29. These shoes still exist, and are preserved by Mme Annie Guéhenno.
30. See: J.40. p.20: "Je demeurai (à Peïné) jusqu'à cinq ans".

31. See: *ibid.*, p.58.
32. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... pp.6-7.
33. See: J.40. p.58.
34. See: *ibid.*, p.37.
35. See: *ibid.*, p.41.
36. See: Harvey Goldberg, The Life of Jean Jaurès. Madison, Milwaukee and London, University of Wisconsin Press, 1968, p.133.
37. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.8.
38. See: *ibid.*, p.7. These facts were also confirmed in conversation with the author by Mme Annie Guéhenno, on the 8th May 1984.
39. This is stated in the unpublished "Diplôme de Réception de Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Union Compagnonnique des compagnons du Tour de France des devoirs unis." (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). This fact was also confirmed in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 8th May 1984.
40. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 8th May 1984.
41. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 8th May 1984.
42. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.8. See also: J.40. p.70, where Guéhenno states that "son crime avait été...de fonder à F. un syndicat."
43. This fact was confirmed by P. Sipriot, "Hommage à Jean Guéhenno." Radio-France, 29 septembre 1978. In this programme Sipriot claimed that Guéhenno recalled his mother saying "jamais, jamais tu ne parleras comme ton père".

44. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.7.
45. See: *ibid.*, p.7.
46. *Ibid.*, p.7.
47. See: *ibid.*, p.7. See also: J.40. p.63, "dès cinq heures du matin...jusqu'à onze heures du soir".
48. See: J.40. p.72.
49. See: *ibid.*, pp.74-75.
50. See: *ibid.*, p.78.
51. See: C.V. p.85: "Nôel, c'était le jour où on me donnait une orange". See also: *ibid.*, p.86: "Vers les onze heures ma mère me donnait quelque sous et m'envoyait acheter une orange et une demi-livre de chocolats".
52. See: *ibid.*, p.94.
53. See: *ibid.*, p.94.
54. See: *ibid.*, p.77: "ils achetèrent un petit jardin".
55. See: J.R. p.18.
56. See: C.V. pp.96-97.
57. See: *ibid.*, pp.95-96.
58. See: *ibid.*, p.98.
59. See: J.R. pp.27-28.
60. See: *ibid.*, p.25.
61. See: C.V. pp.100-101.
62. See: *ibid.*, p.109.
63. See: *ibid.*, pp.113-114. Guéhenno recalles that " (Jean-Marie) avait voulu que j'aïlle au collège, quoique les études y fussent payantes".

64. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.8.
65. See: C.V. p.115.
66. See: *ibid.*, p.121.
67. See: *ibid.*, p.78.
68. See: *ibid.*, p.130. See: also: C.Q.J.C. p.44:
"je suis allé...à la messe...jusque vers mes treize
ans".
69. See: C.V. p.131.
70. See: Theodore Zeldin, France 1845-1945. Oxford, Clarendon
Press, 1977, volume 2, p.150.
71. See: *ibid.*, p.183.
72. See: *ibid.*, p.83.
73. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes
on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection
of Mme Annie Guéhenno).
74. See: C.D.V.E. p.114.
75. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.8.
76. See: C.V. p.122.
77. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.8.
78. See: S.L.C.H. p.177.
79. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.8.
80. See: *ibid.*, pp.8-9.
81. This account of the strike is taken from C.V. pp.149-160.
82. See: *ibid.*, p.159, where Guéhenno states that "il leur
avait fallu du courage d'entrer (dans l'usine)".
83. See: *ibid.*, p.147.
84. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.9.

85. Ibid., p.9.
86. Francois Mauriac, "Jean Guéhenno", Le Figaro, 6 août 1946.
87. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.12.
88. Harvey Goldberg, The life of Jean Jaurès. p.53.
89. See: *ibid.*, p.63.
90. See: *ibid.*, p.110.
91. See: *ibid.*, p.63.
92. See: *ibid.*, pp.63 and 283.
93. See: *ibid.*, p.283. Jaurès edited L'histoire Socialiste de la Révolution Française.
94. See: *ibid.*, p.378.
95. See: *ibid.*, p.110.
96. Ibid., p.69.
97. Ibid., p.64, which is a quotation from Jaurès' speech in the chamber of the Conseil Municipal of Toulouse made on the 25th June 1892.
98. Ibid., p.90.
99. Ibid., p.269.
100. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.10.
101. Ibid., pp.10-11.
102. Ibid., p.11.
103. Ibid., p.11.
104. See: Harvey Goldberg, The life of Jean Jaurès. p.9.
105. See: *ibid.*, p.12.
106. See: J.40. p.104.
107. See: C.V. p.141.
108. See: *ibid.*, p.142.

109. See: J.40. p.107. Guéhenno says that "une nuit de janvier 1905 ma décision se trouva prise. Il ne se pouvait pas que le monde fut si borné et si sombre".
110. See: C.V. p.162. Guéhenno says that "avant ma quinzième année je n'eus que mes livres de classe".
111. See: *ibid.*, p.163. Guéhenno says that "quand je fus à l'usine, je me pris pour les livres d'une véritable passion".
112. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.11. See also: C.V. p.134.
113. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno): "(Guéhenno) prépare seul, la nuit son bachot".
114. See: C.V. p.135. Guéhenno states: "j'avais sagement choisi le possible...la section moderne".
115. Stated by the chairman and quoted in Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, volume 2, p.291.
116. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
117. See: C.V. p.147. Guéhenno says that "je dus à un malheur public de pouvoir travailler à mon aise".
118. This is stated in the unpublished "Diplôme de Bachelier de l'Enseignement secondaire de Jean Guéhenno," which is dated Rennes, 24.7.1907. (In the collection of Mme Annie Guéhenno).

119. In a conversation with the author on the 15th May 1984
Mme. Annie Guéhenno stated that Guéhenno was obliged to
sit the baccalaureat in Rennes.
120. See: Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, volume 2, p.272.
121. This is implied in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
See also: C.V. p.122. Guéhenno says of his factory experience
that "cela dura près de quatre années". This implies that
he left the factory some time in the summer of 1908.
122. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on
Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection
of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). See also: Alain Decaux, Discours...
p.11. "(Guéhenno) devient khâgneux au lycée de Rennes".
123. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
124. See: C.V. p.173. Guéhenno states that "j'avais passé un
bac scientifique"
125. This was the case in 1900. See: Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, volume 2, p.250.
126. See: C.V. p.174. Guéhenno recalls that "on décida pour
moi que je préparerais l'École Normale lettres".
127. See: *ibid.*, p.174. Guéhenno refers to himself as "un étrange
khâgneux qui ne savait ni le latin ni le grec".
128. Before 1920, under 3% of French children of secondary
school age attended a lycée. See Theodore Zeldin,
France 1848-1945, volume 2, p.292.

129. See: C.V. p.179. "(Lhostis) était bas breton. Sa mère...
était très pauvre".
130. See: *ibid.*, p.179. Guéhenno recalls that "nous avons
beaucoup raisonné...sur la création".
131. See: *ibid.*, p.179: "Ma révolte le désespérait".
132. For information on Lhostis see: *ibid.*, p.179. for other
friends see: *ibid.*, p.175.
133. See: *ibid.*, p.178.
134. These facts were stated in conversation with the author
by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 15th May 1984.
135. See: C.V. p.180: "J'avais échoué en juillet, au concours
de l'École Normale". This was confirmed by Mme. Annie Guéhenno
in conversation with the author on the 15th May 1984.
Mme. Guéhenno recalled her husband blaming the poor teaching
standards at Rennes for his lack of success in July 1910.
136. See: C.V. p.201, where he mentions Agay.
137. This was stated by Mme. Annie Guéhenno in conversation with
the author, on the 15th May 1984.
138. See: C.V. p.201. Guéhenno recalls that "le député de ma
petite ville m'avait procuré la place".
139. See: *ibid.*, pp.201-211. This is the view of Mme. Annie Guéhenno,
expressed in conversation with the author, on the 15th May 1984.
140. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno,
on the 15th May 1984.
141. This is the date given in the unpublished "Diplôme de Bachelier
de l'Enseignement secondaire de Jean Guéhenno," (In the collection
of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

142. See: C.V. p.181. Guéhenno recalls his last visit to his father: "Il ne me reconnut pas. Je repartis passer l'oral. Je revins pour l'enterrement". Alain Decaux however, claims that "c'est entre l'écrit et l'oral que Jean-Marie Guéhenno... est enfin délivré de son long calvaire". Alain Decaux, Discours...p.11.
143. See: C.V. p.180.
144. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.11.
145. See: *ibid.*, p.6: "à vingt ans, après la mort de son père, il a choisi de s'appeler Jean". This was also confirmed in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 8th May 1984.
146. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 15th May 1984.
147. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 15th May 1984.
148. Gaston Doumergue became Président du Conseil in 1913.
See: Harvey Goldberg, The life of Jean Jaurès. p.444.
149. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 15th May 1984.
150. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 15th May 1984.
151. See: C.V. p.181. Guéhenno states that "J'obtins...une bourse d'externat à Louis-le-Grand".
152. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 15th May 1984.

153. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). Guéhenno was therefore part of the promotion of 1911, since at the École Normale promotion denoted year of entry. For information on this see: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society. London, Macgibbon and Kee, 1959, p.61, Note 7.
154. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.31.
155. See: *ibid.*, p.31.
156. See: Theodore Zeldin, France 1948-1945, volume 2, p.334.
157. See: *ibid.*, p.334. See also: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society, p.55.
158. See: Albert Thibaudet, La République des Professeurs. Genève, Slatkine Reprints, coll: "Ressources", 1979, p.121. (Originally published in 1927); Thibaudet claims that 80-90% of the students at the École Normale had grants.
159. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche. p.31.
160. See: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society, p.60.
161. See: *ibid.*, p.60.
162. See: *ibid.*, p.60.
163. Daniel Hálevy, Péguy et les Cahiers de la Quinzaine. Paris, Grasset, 1941, pp.50;51. (Originally published in 1918).
164. See: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society. p.60.
165. See: *ibid.*, p.61.
166. See: *ibid.*, p.61.

167. See: Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, volume 2, p.334.

See also: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.35:

l'esprit normalien ne définissait guère des choix politiques"

168. See: Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, volume 2, p.337.

169. See: *ibid.*, volume 2, p.337.

170. See: J.40. p.126: "la ferveur était à la mode".

171. See: *ibid.*, p.124. Guéhenno claims that "dans mes propres souvenirs je n'entends sonner aucun clairon".

172. See: *ibid.*, p.132.

173. See: C.V. p.182: "J'avais décidé d'apprendre le grec et pour cela de quitter la philosophie pour les lettres, et je m'étais mis à lire Platon...C'est ainsi que m'apparut le Logos. Il était le dieu inconnu que le cherchais...Je passai toute une année à lire presque uniquement Platon".

174. See: L.M.D.A. p.99. Guéhenno states that "J'avais beaucoup lu Barrès avant la guerre et l'avais beaucoup admiré... Certaine inflexion de sa phrase...m'avait paru la plus belle... expression...d'une inquiétude...dont les hommes de ma génération ont souffert vers 1910".

175. See: C.à H. p.148. Guéhenno states that "vous (Barrès) nous avez enchantés. Cela dura pour moi jusqu'au temps où je lus vos Déracinés".

176. See: J.40. p.128, for the opinion that "chacun de nous pensait être ce Nathanaël".

177. See: C.D.V.E. p.69, Guéhenno recalls that "comme j'avais vingt ans, la lecture de... l'Avenir de la science, contribua grandement à changer ma vie".

178. The 1905 generation loved irrationality. See: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society, p.337.
179. See: J.40. p.138. Guéhenno admits that "je jouissais de mon déracinement".
180. See: C.V. p.131: "Tant que dura la bataille je n'ai pensé qu'à moi...plus tard...la bataille gagnée, la fidélité (aux pauvres) m'est venue.
181. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.11.
182. Ibid., pp.11-12.
183. See: J.40. p.141. Guéhenno states that "je me considérais... comme un délégué...des pauvres".
184. See: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society. p.241.
185. See: C.V. p.189. Guehenno says that "il (Quéré) avait été promu depuis des années, de la cuisine à la bibliothèque".
186. This is the view of Alain Decaux. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.11. Decaux claims that "Ils seront...dans la même turne quatre inséparables. See also:C.V. p.182, Guéhenno refers to "mes cothurnes Durckheim et Vaillant".
187. See: J.40. p.135. Guéhenno recalls: "Il y avait... notre "petit évêque"...dont nous savions qu'il...entrerait au séminaire d'Issy".
188. See: Alain Decaux Discours... p.11. Decaux claims that "Durckheim sera tué à la guerre".
189. See: S.L.C.H. p.192. Guéhenno refers to "Jacques Desjardins, inspecteur général de l'Instruction publique".

190. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.5. Decaux claims that
"quand on annonçait un spectacle télévisé de qualité,
(Guéhenno) se rendait chez son ami, le professeur Vaillant
que habitait le même immeuble".
191. See: L.M.D.A. p.148. Guéhenno states that "(Etévé) était mon
"camarade"...nous étions ensemble à l'École Normale. Il est mort".
192. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.12. Decaux states that
"entré à l'École en 1911, la même année que Maurice Genevoix
(Guéhenno)"...
193. Maurice Genevoix, "Hommage à Jean Guéhenno", in Jean Guehenno -
Extrait de L'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de l'École Normale
Supérieure, Paris, 1979.
194. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.11. Decaux states that
"il (Guéhenno) a obtenu une bourse d'externat".
195. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno,
on the 8th May 1984. ...
196. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.12. Decaux states that
"entré à l'École en 1911 (Guéhenno) devait en sortir en 1914".
197. See: F.D. p.142.
198. In August 1914. This is stated in the unpublished
Jean Guehenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection
of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
199. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on
Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Gueñenno. (In the collection of
Mme. Annie Guéhenno). It is also stated in the unpublished
Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the
collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

200. See: J.40. p.150: "C'était dans une petite ville du Centre".

See also: *ibid*, p.173, where Guéhenno states that "je rejoignis la ville de C."

201. In a conversation with the author on the 14th May 1984, Mme. Annie Guéhenno stated that Guéhenno always told his family that his reason for going to fight in 1914, was a sense of solidarity with his friends.

202. See: L.M.D.A. p.50. Guéhenno claims that "je ne l'ai lu qu'après la guerre".

203. This is however a very late opinion. See: *ibid.*, p.50 where Guéhenno states that "je l'ai admiré".

204. See: J.40. p.174. Guéhenno claims that "je tombai malade et dus attendre encore".

205. See: *ibid.*, p.175. Guéhenno claims that: "en octobre ou novembre, je reviens au dépôt".

206. This is almost certainly Durckheim.

207. See: J.40. p.150. "C'était un matin d'hiver".

208. See: Biographical notes, in Jean Guéhenno, - Extrait de l'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de l'École Normale Supérieure, 1979.

209. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). It is also stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

210. See: J.40. p.154, Guéhenno recalls that "le soir on y était en Belgique. An delà de Vlamertinghe. La guerre traînait son long corps...du côté d'Ypres".
211. This is because in L.M.D.A. p.173, Guéhenno states: "J'ai quelques petites photos de Février ou Mars 1915...C'était en Belgique, du côté d'Ypres".
212. See: J.40. p.159: "Je n'ai pas été un grand guerrier".
213. See: *ibid.*, pp.162-163. Guéhenno states that to have survived the war, you had to be a coward at times.
214. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). It is also stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
215. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 14th May 1984. See also Alain Decaux, Discours.... p.12. Decaux states that "soudain...une balle est venue le frapper en plein front".
216. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). It is also stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
217. See: C.D.V.E. p.84. Guéhenno recalls: "J'étais blessé, à l'hôpital, dans un petit village des Flandres".

218. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 14th May 1984.
219. See: D.L.D.P. pp.90-91. Guéhenno recalls: "J'étais à Rouen, dans un hôpital...J'achetai et je lus Jean Barois... J'ai écrit sur la page de garde: Rouen, 29 mars 1915".
220. See: H. Stuart Hughes, The Obstructed Path. New York, Evanston, London, Harper and Row, Harper Torchbooks, 1969 , p.109.
221. See: *ibid.*, p.115.
222. See: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society. p.344.
223. See: H. Stuart Hughes, The Obstructed Path. p.117.
224. See: *ibid.*, p.117.
225. André Thérive, "Les livres, Jean Guéhenno, Jeunesse de la France", Le Temps, 28 mai 1936, p.3.
226. See: H. Stuart Hughes, The Obstructed Path, p.108.
227. See: *ibid.*, p.114.
228. See: *ibid.*, p.108.
229. See: Présentation de Jean Guéhenno, Comte L. Tolstoi, La mort d'Ivan Ilitch et autres contes. Paris, A.Colin, 1958, p. XXIV. Guéhenno identified with Tolstoy partly because the latter also worked as a cobbler.
230. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
231. See: J.40. p.211, where Guéhenno says: "J'avais été déclaré inapte"". See also: D.L.D.P. p.128, where he states: "J'étais blessé...devenu "inapte" au vrai service et à la mort".

232. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
233. See: L.M.D.A. pp.108-109: "J'étais depuis des mois dans la révolte et le désespoir".
234. See: F.D. pp.175-176.
235. See: Rabindranath Tagore, Towards Universal Man. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1967 edition, p.21.
236. Rabindranath Tagore, Nationalism. London, Macmillan & Co., 1917. Quoted in L.M.D.A. p.199.
237. Humayun Kabir, Introduction in Rabindranath Tagore, Towards Universal Man. p.11.
238. Ibid., p.19.
239. See: ibid., p.5. "Tagore had a sane and sympathetic understanding of Western values".
240. Ibid., p.29.
241. See: Humayun Kabir, Preface, in Rabindranath Tagore, Towards Universal Man. p.IX: Kabir states: "Universal Man... (was) the goal towards which Tagore was moving throughout his life".
242. See: Humayun Kabir, Introduction, in Rabindranath Tagore, Towards Universal Man. p.7 : "it was impossible for (Tagore) to accept a conception of art divorced from life".
243. See: L.M.D.A. p.108. Guehenno recalls: "Un jour de l'hiver 1915, à Lyon J'entraï dans une librairie et demandai.. Au-dessus de la mêlée. Le libraire me poussa vers la porte... Je finis pourtant par me procurer cet objet de scandale".

244. See: D.L.D.P. p.175. Guéhenno recalls: "J'avais lu, dans l'avant guerre...Jean-Christophe".
245. See: Who's Who in France 1978, p.816.
246. See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.13.
247. Stated in conversation with the author by Mme Annie Guéhenno, on the 13th May 1984.
248. See: biographical notes, in Jean Guéhenno - Extrait de l'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de l'École Normale Supérieure, 1979: "(Guéhenno) dirige jusqu'en août 1919 une école de rééducation d'aveugles de guerre". See also: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.12. Decaux claims: "(Guéhenno) rééduquera notamment des soldats devenus aveugles". This is also confirmed in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno): "Guéhenno dirige une école de rééducation d'aveugles de guerre".
249. See: C.D.V.E. p.117. Guéhenno recalls: "Une nuit des bombes tombèrent tout près de nous...Brieux décida que nous irions...dans in château, à La Rochecorbon"
250. For a description of Guéhenno's visit to Anatole France see: J.40. pp.212-213: "Un jour de L'été 1917 j'allai...rendre visite à Anatole France, Ce sage, il y avait trois ans, avait été fou comme tout le monde...Mais assez tôt il s'était ressaisi".
251. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.12.
252. Ibid., p.12.
253. Ibid., p.13.

254. See: L.M.D.A. p.198. Guéhenno states that "je ne saurais dire de quel secours...me fut dans la dernière année de la guerre (le Nationalisme de Tagore) et Walt Whitman, que des amis américains me firent alors connaître".
255. Gay Wilson Allen, Walt Whitman Handbook. New York, Hendricks House, 1962, p.2.
256. Ibid., p.237.
257. Ibid., p.189.
258. See: ibid., p.189.
259. Ibid., p.356.
260. Richard M. Bucke, Walt Whitman. Philadelphia, David McKay, 1883. pp.183-185.
261. Gay Wilson Allen, Walt Whitman Handbook. p.267.
262. Ibid., p.45.
263. Ibid., pp.46-47.
264. See: F.D. p.109.
265. Jean Guéhenno, "Whitman, Wilson et L'Esprit moderne", La Revue de Paris, 1 janvier 1919.
266. These are: Jean Guéhenno, "Le sens du Monde, La Grande Revue, avril 1919, pp.177-193. Jean Guéhenno, "Entre le passé et l'avenir, La Grande Revue, mai 1919, pp.399-410. Jean Guéhenno, "Le Sens du Peuple", La Grande Revue, juin 1919, pp.576-589.
267. See: L.M.D.A. p.193. Guéhenno asks himself: "Qu'est il advenu de ces pouvoirs merveilleux dont je me promettais qu'ils allaient renouveler notre vie?"

268. Jean Guéhenno, "Le Sens du Peuple", La Grande Revue, juin 1919, pp. 400-401.
269. The article in question is: Jean Guéhenno, "Le Message de l'Orient: Rabindranath Tagore", La Revue de Paris, 1 septembre 1919.
270. See: Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, "L'indépendance de l'esprit" Correspondance entre Jean Guehenno et Romain Rolland 1919-1944. Paris, Éditions Albin Michel, 1975, p.15. Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 4th July 1919.
271. See: J.40. p.214. Guéhenno recalls his visit to Anatole France: "nous portions des médailles, des galons". This can also be seen on the unpublished photograph of Jean Guéhenno at La Rochecorbon, where he is wearing a military uniform. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
272. This is the date given in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). It is confirmed in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Chapter Two

Apprenticeship (1919-1928)

One of the last to be demobilised⁽¹⁾, Guéhenno left La Rochecorbon and returned to Paris to the École Normale Supérieure, where he continued his studies for the concours of the Agrégation des Lettres, which he had failed earlier in 1914. The break in his studies was not as serious as it might appear, as he maintained his contact with the university whilst in the army, registering as a student at the École Normale in the academic year 1918-1919⁽²⁾. Being a married man however, it was not possible for him to study full-time. He therefore sought employment and was given a one year contract as Professeur de Lettres at the Lycée de Douai, for the academic year 1919-1920⁽³⁾. This enabled him to move out of his temporary lodgings at 27 Bld. Victor Hugo, Neuilly sur Seine⁽⁴⁾, and take up residence at 3 rue Boissonade in the 14^e arrondissement⁽⁵⁾.

1920 was an eventful year for Guéhenno, as in that year he made certain choices which affected both his public, private and professional life. In December 1920 the French Socialist Party (S.F.I.O) held its Congress at Tours which led to the permanent division of the working movement on communist and socialist lines. Although the immediate issue at Tours was the question of joining the Third International, the root of the problem was the attitude of Russia and Leninist doctrine. When in January 1919 Moscow set up the Third International, its ideals, which included the immediate overthrow of capitalism, the arming of the masses against the bourgeoisie, the acceptance of violence, and the call for a dictatorship of the proletariat, were not greeted with enthusiasm⁽⁶⁾. The national conference of the S.F.I.O. held in April 1919 rejected the programme as a whole, and voted to

stay in the Second International for the time being⁽⁷⁾. The divisions caused by the creation of the Third International were not limited to the French movement, but were to cause problems on a global scale. The Swiss socialists joined the Third International, and the Germans gave it strong support⁽⁸⁾, but the British Labour Party was opposed to Bolschevik methods⁽⁹⁾ and at the 1919 International Conference at Berne, it gave its support along with Polish and Swedish socialists, to a minority motion condemning dictatorship in Russia⁽¹⁰⁾. In France the internal problems of the S.F.I.O. were aggravated by electoral failure in November 1919⁽¹¹⁾. The first serious splits in party unity occurred at the Strasbourg Conference of 1920, when some delegates supported the Third International and others remained faithful to the Second. The uncertainty of the majority⁽¹²⁾, was the only reason a semblance of unity was possible. Matters did however come to a head in December 1920 at the Tours Conference. Here three differing views were taken by the delegates. Some supported Moscow, some opposed the Third International and some, the "reconstructionists" supported Moscow with reservations, because they remained faithful to syndicalism and parliamentary democracy⁽¹³⁾. The issue now was whether to join Moscow or stay autonomous⁽¹⁴⁾. Nonetheless the majority of the delegates voted to join the Third International, which led to the break-up of the party⁽¹⁵⁾. At the time of separation, the new Parti Communiste Français (P.C.F.) took with it 75% of the old S.F.I.O., but this was a mixed blessing, because the new P.C.F. numbered among its members so many anarchists, pacifists and other undisciplined elements, that damaging purges and crises were inevitable⁽¹⁶⁾. This in turn enabled the S.F.I.O.

to recover⁽¹⁷⁾ and re-establish itself as the main representative of the French Left. The P.C.F. doctrine of "classe contre classe", which was party policy in the years 1920-1934⁽¹⁸⁾, and which led to electoral disasters in the years 1928-1932⁽¹⁹⁾, was particularly damaging not only to itself, but also to the French Left as a whole⁽²⁰⁾.

Guéhenno's reaction to the divisions of the Left, was to stand aloof from them. In Alain Decaux's opinion:

"Il n'a pas voulu choisir, dit-il "entre ces deux fractions du peuple dont le Congrès de Tours venait de faire des ennemis"...Guéhenno déclarait avec force que "la scission de Tours lui paraissait une véritable trahison d'une cause qui ne pouvait pas cesser d'être commune"(21).

Decaux takes Guéhenno's account in La Foi difficile of 1957 as being the definitive one. Nevertheless a more concrete reason does exist for Guéhenno's refusal to choose between socialists and communists: his inability to support Bolshevik methods. A supporter of revolution in Russia, he also maintained that "cela ne signifie nullement que les Français, eux, doivent changer de méthode" (F.D. p.44). Guéhenno gives a very frank and accurate account of his attitude in Carnets du vieil écrivain:

"Cette révolution d'Octobre me paraissait être la Révolution française relancée par de nouveaux Jacobins. Mais, à mesure que je sus davantage, l'inquiétude en moi grandit... Un parti ne devait pas être chez nous une police. Dès lors, je décidai de n'appartenir jamais à aucun parti. Je ne pouvais choisir et ne me suis jamais proposé que la réconciliation des frères ennemis"
(C.D.V.E. p.102).

There is no doubt that Guéhenno made a conscious decision to remain outside the Communist Party. He recalls that a friend

who was a party member tried to persuade him to join soon after Tours. When Guéhenno refused, the friend's reaction was to shun him and condemn him: "C'est lui le premier qui m'accusa de trahison" (F.D. p.57). After this incident he was to experience other examples of communist intolerance⁽²²⁾, which made him increasingly hostile to the P.C.F. Some further reasons for Guéhenno's hostility to parties as such also require consideration. Of great importance here is Guéhenno's personality: as an individualist he was unlikely to accept party discipline, or support policies which conflicted with his own views. The example of his father Jean-Marie, who was also a non-party man, must have been a factor, given Guéhenno's admiration for him. Guéhenno's continuing fidelity to the pre-1914 socialist ideal represented by Jaurès gave him further grounds for not joining either of the fractions of the old S.F.I.O. David Caute takes the view that whatever Guéhenno's thoughts about Russia, as far as France was concerned he believed only in "Jaurès, truth and justice"⁽²³⁾. Finally there is Romain Rolland's example and his private advice to Guéhenno, which undoubtedly confirmed Guéhenno in his non-partisan attitude, even when in the 1930's he became deeply involved in political matters. Romain Rolland taught him that "chacun doit tâcher de saisir l'appel de la voix intérieure... Soyez, à celui-ci ou à celui-là, un libre allié volontaire, qui ne s'engage jamais au-delà d'une action donnée et limitée"⁽²⁴⁾. Such advice was hardly necessary however, as by the time he began regular correspondence with Romain Rolland in 1928, Guéhenno was emphatic that "j'ai l'habitude de la pensée absolument libre, parce-que solitaire"⁽²⁵⁾.

Guéhenno's attitude to political parties shows he did not change his fundamental views after the experiences of 1914-1919, because he still defended personal freedom and believed himself to be self-sufficient. The fact that his personal circumstances in 1920 were not unlike those of 1914, accounts for the consistency in his views. Guéhenno's main problem in 1920 was the same as in 1914: the Agrégation. He was therefore obliged to acknowledge the importance of the virtues of self reliance as these alone were likely to help him. When he was awarded third place in the concours of the Agrégation des Lettres in the summer of 1920⁽²⁶⁾, he was vindicated in his long-held view that progress comes with personal effort. It is not therefore surprising that Guéhenno subsequently had sufficient confidence in himself, not to need support for his views from a party doctrine.

The successful completion of his studies forced Guéhenno to give serious consideration to his future career. His general prospects were excellent, particularly since the friendship of École Normale secretary Paul Dupuy ensured that Guéhenno would have no trouble finding work in Paris and making money⁽²⁷⁾. Guéhenno however claims that "je n'étais pas content" (F.D. p.22). He recalls that "la facilité me gênait" (F.D. p.27). Other possibilities also existed for him, as the articles he published in 1919 resulted in an offer from a newspaper proprietor to write a political column for an unnamed semi-official state newspaper⁽²⁸⁾. Guéhenno's proud nature prevented him from taking up this offer as he refused to take a pseudonym or to compromise his views⁽²⁹⁾. In financial terms, the most attractive offer Guéhenno received was through his mother, who acted as intermediary between her son and

the owner of the shoe factory where he once worked. Guéhenno remembers this in his last work:

"Mon ancien patron la chargea de me faire une étrange commission: il souhaitait m'associer à son fils, comme patron de l'usine. Ce fut la première occasion que j'eus de devenir riche. Naturellement, je refusai. J'avais décidément mauvais caractère. Je lui fis une autre peine en prétendant avoir fait tout seul ce que j'avais fait" (D.L.D.P. p.78).

There is a certain irony in the fact that it was Guéhenno's mother who wanted him to be a factory director, because she never encouraged him to leave the working class, and always accused him of having become a bourgeois⁽³⁰⁾. The problem with Guéhenno in 1920, was that after his success in the Agrégation he would not accept help from anyone⁽³¹⁾, as it was now a matter of principle for him that all his achievements would be his alone. It also seems likely that Guéhenno was suffering from a form of depression. To the already quoted references of discontent and fear of facility, should be added a temporary loss of interest in literature⁽³²⁾. All these factors combined resulted in Guéhenno's decision to definitively cut all his ties with his previous existence and take up the relatively unattractive post of Professeur de Rhétorique, at the Lycée de Lille⁽³³⁾. There is a certain morbidity about his choice of town, as Lille is only a short distance from where he fought in the trenches in 1915. The very fact that Guéhenno wanted to return to the site of the war does however demonstrate, that he had not yet come to terms with it.

Guéhenno spent seven years in Lille⁽³⁴⁾, during which time he gained promotion to the post of Professeur de Rhétorique Supérieure, and created the first khâgne ever seen in the Lycée de Lille⁽³⁵⁾.

His choice of teaching as a career was one of the most important decisions he made in his life, and it is one he never regretted. The reasons behind this decision are therefore a matter of some importance. Teaching was certainly a traditional means of rising from the proletariat⁽³⁶⁾, and moreover when Guéhenno chose the École Normale Supérieure, he already committed himself to a teaching career, in as much as the preparation of teachers for secondary and higher education was the main purpose of the École. The choice of the École Normale Supérieure was in a sense forced upon him, because this was one of the few Grandes Écoles to give grants. Given his financial resources, Guéhenno would have found it difficult to study medicine, engineering or law, as grants for these courses were very scarce⁽³⁷⁾. Nevertheless, a teaching career was not the inevitable result of studying at the École Normale. Guéhenno himself was offered other more financially attractive careers, so his decision to become a teacher was his own free choice. The teaching of the Rhétorique courses, which he specialised in, evidently appealed to him, and his choice of these courses shows that his post-war disenchantment with literature was only temporary. As Professeur de Rhétorique, he was able to indulge his long-standing personal interest in literature in a professional capacity. It is as well to remember however, that although the name "rhétorique" remained, the subject was no longer taught in the nineteenth century sense, when its popularity rested on the teaching of speech-writing⁽³⁸⁾. Attacked during the Second Empire by D. Ordinaire, who argued that rhetoric cannot be taught, and moreover that fashions change⁽³⁹⁾, the subject was abolished in this form in 1902⁽⁴⁰⁾. When Guéhenno began his teaching career, rhetoric was understood in its post-Ferry

sense, with emphasis being placed on textual analysis⁽⁴¹⁾. Furthermore the stress on the construction of essays⁽⁴²⁾, was now counterbalanced by the interest in literary history⁽⁴³⁾. Finally the specifically French view that language learning should also involve training the mind⁽⁴⁴⁾, affected the teaching of the subject, and is particularly relevant to Guéhenno's understanding of his function as teacher.

There is a high degree of agreement concerning Guéhenno's teaching aims and methods. Alain Decaux claims that "j'ai été frappé...par l'unanimité des souvenirs (des anciens élèves)"⁽⁴⁵⁾. Moreover there is agreement between Guéhenno's stated aims, and his pupils' recollections of his practical exposition of them, through his teaching. Guéhenno says he taught his students the eloquence he hated, but warned them against using it irresponsibly⁽⁴⁶⁾. In this respect he did not differ from other teachers who spread an "educated", elaborate way of talking, but he was particularly concerned that rhetoric did not lead to better thinking or introspection⁽⁴⁷⁾. In the course of explaining Latin, Greek and French texts⁽⁴⁸⁾, Alain Decaux believes that "Guéhenno a émerveillé plus de vingt classes qui apprenaient de lui l'intelligence, l'intuition, la clarté, la tolérance, la beauté - en un mot l'humanisme"⁽⁴⁹⁾. Henri Coulet, a former pupil of Guéhenno, remembers his debt to him: "j'admirai...avec quelle constance Jean Guéhenno maintint jusqu'à la fin son idéal d'humaniste"⁽⁵⁰⁾. Humanism was Guéhenno's ideal, because he believed his duty was to improve his students morally and spiritually, as well as academically. He himself told his students: "Je suis ici messieurs, pour vous aider à devenir...des hommes"⁽⁵¹⁾. Guéhenno was frank about his

personal preferences, a fact noted by several commentators:

Alain Decaux states: "comment il expliquait Pascal, lui qui n'était pas pascalien!"⁽⁵²⁾. This attitude to Pascal - a desire to understand his point of view despite being in disagreement with it, is also noted by Max Milner, a former pupil⁽⁵³⁾, and Mme. Annie Guéhenno⁽⁵⁴⁾. Another former pupil Jean-Pierre Richard, recalls that "l'art pour l'art, l'art narcissique, Guéhenno le détestait, et avec quelle force obstinée!... il avait bien évidemment ses préférences...et cela malgré...son désir de ne comprendre et estimer chacun que dans la perspective qu'il s'était à lui-même assignée"⁽⁵⁵⁾. For Guéhenno, humanism was "une aventure" (F.D. p.78), and whatever his preferences he claimed he never sought to reduce a text or an author, stressing instead the uniqueness and beauty of each one⁽⁵⁶⁾. Jean-Pierre Richard clearly feels Guéhenno succeeded in this: "Il voulait mettre en évidence...la singularité d'un point de vue"⁽⁵⁷⁾. Max Milner recalls that Guéhenno's teaching was based on close study of texts, but at the same time his enthusiasm for them was infectious⁽⁵⁸⁾. This view is shared by other former pupils, who all agree that Guéhenno was "un maître "unique, irremplacé, inimitable"⁽⁵⁹⁾. Henri Coulet remembers

"son extrême simplicité, la gentillesse attentive qui le rendait si proche de ses élèves, sa générosité, ses mouvements de sensibilité et ses gaîtés, la chaleur de ses enthousiasmes, il n'est personne que cette façon si peu professorale d'être professeur n'ait attaché à lui"⁽⁶⁰⁾.

Jean-Pierre Richard recalls Guéhenno's admiration for authors who professed "un certain message de grandeur partagée, un appel à la liberté et à la dignité des hommes"⁽⁶¹⁾. He believes that for Guéhenno:

"Enseigner,...c'était faire appel à ces mêmes valeurs dans la foule vivante, écoutante, de tous les élèves et disciples; c'était peut-être les y inséminer, à travers une pratique tout à la fois charnelle et réfléchie, intelligente et émotive, des textes où il leur avait été historiquement donné de se parler"(62).

Jean-Pierre Richard also claims that Guéhenno's example inspired others: "Guéhenno donna à beaucoup d'entre nous...le désir d'être des enseignants aussi, des enseignants qui lui ressembleraient"(63). Jean Deprun recalls how in October 1941, when asked to present the "vœux de la khâgne" to Guéhenno, "nous ne cherchions ni à flatter ni à ménager notre maître: notre enthousiasme était sans mélange, voilà tout"(64). Such enthusiasm was undoubtedly only possible because Guéhenno loved teaching(65), which became one of the goals in his life. His friend André Chamson had this to say of Guéhenno: "il a consacré sa vie à...deux idées principales: Le pacifisme et l'éducation des jeunes hommes"(66). Although Guéhenno emphasises the professional satisfaction he found in teaching, his career also brought him material well-being, even in his early years in Lille, when he lived at 87 rue B. Delespand(67). In La Foi difficile he describes himself as well off(68), and he had at least one servant, because he remembers taking her to hospital after she became pregnant(69).

Despite the fact that Guéhenno temporarily lost his taste for literature in 1920 and that this was one of the reasons which made him go to Lille, it was in Lille that he first began to write seriously(70). This early writing has a personal rather than a literary significance, because it has to be seen in the context of Guéhenno recovering from the psychological wounds caused by war,

by moving to the provincial backwater of Lille, where as he himself says: "j'ai connu...une assez sombre solitude" (F.D.p.39). His only companions at this time were his wife and child, and he recalls going for walks with them along the town's fortifications⁽⁷¹⁾. The early writing, like the move to Lille, is best understood as a therapy. In La Foi difficile Guéhenno admits this was indeed the case, when he says that he wrote "pour me mettre enfin d'accord avec le monde et avec moi-même" (F.D. p.39). Although he maintained an irregular collaboration with La Grande Revue, where he published "Les relations intellectuelles entre la France et l'Allemagne"⁽⁷²⁾, La Revue de Paris⁽⁷³⁾, and La Revue Européenne⁽⁷⁴⁾ whilst in Lille, Guéhenno now concentrated on writing more substantial works. He remembers that:

"mon premier travail fut d'écrire une sorte de roman lyrique que j'intitulai: La Jeunesse morte. Je le portai à un éditeur. Il n'en voulut pas. Mais j'étais dans une grande fièvre. Je continuais d'écrire" (L.M.D.A. p.188).

Guéhenno also describes this novel as "un roman autobiographique" (F.D. p.32), and claims that the publisher's reaction to it was due to the nature of its subject matter, the 1914-1918 war: "la guerre fut démodée" (F.D. p.33). This last point is however open to debate, as Guéhenno also took the view that the novel was artistically flawed⁽⁷⁵⁾. This first project soon gave way to another, the inspiration for which came from observing the work and lifestyle of Eugène Brieux: "Je décidai d'écrire une pièce, un roman, pensant entrer ainsi dans la République des Lettres. J'en avais le titre: l'Interdite. Je n'en fus jamais capable" (C.D.V.E. p.119).

Failure in both these major projects persuaded Guéhenno to change genre. The death of Lenin in 1924⁽⁷⁶⁾ gave him the incentive he needed to write a biography, which he recalls in Carnets du vieil écrivain:

"J'appris le russe...afin d'écrire un Lénine. J'ai longtemps accumulé des notes. Nul n'a plus profondément troublé la conscience de l'Occident. Je lus tous ses livres d'abord dans une sorte d'enthousiasme. J'admirais son réalisme et jusqu'à son cynisme et ses ruses, cette manière sérieuse qu'il avait "de se comporter avec ses rêves""(C.D.V.E. p.101).

Guéhenno clearly admired Lenin as a man:

"J'aimais sa dureté, sa rigueur, sa... simplicité implacable, sa haine, son horreur de la souffrance des hommes, sa volonté de la guérir, surtout son dégoût des pharisiens. Je retrouvais dans l'Iskra...des impressions de ma jeunesse à l'usine" (C.Q.J.C. pp.150-151).

This personal sympathy did not however imply support for Soviet communism, or even wholesale endorsement of Lenin's views. The views on violence especially, were totally alien to Guéhenno, who claims in La Mort des autres, that:

"je savais, en 1921, ce qu'avaient été les faiblesses de la seconde Internationale, mais la justification de la violence, dont la troisième Internationale faisait un préliminaire, m'écartera d'elle dès l'abord. Je ne pense pas qu'elle soit jamais légitime" (L.M.D.A. p.170).

The question of violence is central to Guéhenno's ultimate rejection of Lenin. In La Foi difficile he claims that despite a promising beginning and the effort involved, he never finished the biography because of a personal distaste for violence, "la peur du sang" (F.D. p.59), which he could not overcome and which had prevented him

from supporting the newly-formed P.C.F. in 1920. Guéhenno finally abandoned Lénine in "1932...quand la conjoncture politique en Russie me parut réduire la plus grande espérance à n'être que la matière d'un nouveau catéchisme" (C.Q.J.C. p.152). Nonetheless he still had enough sympathy for both Lenin and his creation, to prevent him publishing a book which would attack Lenin, and thereby help the bourgeoisie⁽⁷⁷⁾. At the same time it should be remembered that Guéhenno's attitude in March 1917 makes his view of bolshevism problematic from the outset. What interested in in the Bolshevik Revolution was above all its leader. Therefore, when he abandoned his book in 1932, he did so because he changed his view of Lenin's life work, in the light of greater knowledge about the heritage Lenin left in the U.S.S.R. Nonetheless Guéhenno's unpublished Lénine is important in as far as it prefigures his approach in L'Évangile éternel. In a letter to Romain Rolland he states that he wished to write about the Lenin he admired, that is to say the legend of Lenin⁽⁷⁸⁾. In L'Évangile éternel Guéhenno also takes a selective and sympathetic view of his subject.

In addition to teaching and writing, Guéhenno travelled extensively during his years in Lille. Initially he spent his holidays in Fougères with his mother, but her accusations that he was a bourgeois made him feel ashamed and uncomfortable⁽⁷⁹⁾. He also feared the questions of former working class friends⁽⁸⁰⁾, and was forced to realise he no longer belonged in their environment: "la vie nous avait séparés...j'avais perdu la simplicité" (F.D. p.40). Given such circumstances, Guéhenno took to travelling abroad. In 1921 he visited Venice, where he wrote a highly critical letter to Barrès, attacking him for his nationalism and his hatred of the masses

in Les Déracinés⁽⁸¹⁾. The sight of Right-wing political propaganda posters in Verona made a great impression on him, and he later says that this was evidence that "la guerre civile en Europe avait commencé" (F.D. p.38). Guéhenno also visited Belgium, Holland, Serbia, Dalmatia, as well as making a return visit to Italy⁽⁸²⁾. Travel did not however cure him of a morbid obsession with war and death. As well as going for walks along the war-time fortifications around Lille with his wife and young daughter Louise, he recalls visits to his father's grave, where he sought comfort from the alienation of "déclassement"⁽⁸³⁾.

In 1905 Guéhenno published an article attacking Drieu La Rochelle in Les Cahiers Verts⁽⁸⁴⁾ which was to have profound consequences for his subsequent career because it immediately brought him to the attention of the director of the series Daniel Halévy. It also gained him an invitation to Halévy's salon⁽⁸⁵⁾, where he became a regular guest from the mid 1920s⁽⁸⁶⁾. This was a very important experience for Guéhenno, because it brought him into contact with the literary elite and enabled him to meet people who became first his friends, and later his collaborators on his publishing ventures. Daniel Halévy himself was a high bourgeois Jew⁽⁸⁷⁾, whose family had played a significant role in the arts. His great grandfather was a well-known writer of hymns⁽⁸⁸⁾, whilst his grandfather's brother Jacques François Fromental attained fame in the musical field as a composer⁽⁸⁹⁾. Halévy's grandfather Léon was head of literature at the École Polytechnique in 1831⁽⁴⁰⁾, and his father Ludovic wrote librettos and collaborated with Offenbach, as well as taking an interest in the social problem⁽⁹¹⁾.

A classmate of Proust at the Lycée Condorcet where his chief interest was literature⁽⁹²⁾, Halévy took pains to surround himself with the literary elite at his luncheon parties, to which Gide and Paul Valéry were invited⁽⁹³⁾. Further contacts came through the salon of his aunt Strauss, which attracted the most famous statesmen and artists including Proust, who is claimed to have been inspired to write A la recherche d'un temps perdu in this salon⁽⁹⁴⁾. Because he never needed to work, Halévy could devote himself to literature, which became his purpose in life⁽⁹⁵⁾. He took a great interest in Barrès' "culte du moi", which he understood as "self-indulgence and a broadening of one's experience"⁽⁹⁶⁾, and like Barrès, he also tried to reconcile tradition with individualism⁽⁹⁷⁾. The two remained friends despite taking opposite sides during the Dreyfus Affair⁽⁹⁸⁾. It was the Affair which obliged Halévy to take an interest in non-literary matters, although it was in the salon of his aunt Strauss - a centre for the revisionists, that he first became aware of it⁽⁹⁹⁾. The Affair changed Halévy, who now became a Republican as well as an individualist⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. He was especially attracted to Jaurès' social reformism⁽¹⁰¹⁾, and helped set up L'Humanité for him, although he left the newspaper shortly afterwards⁽¹⁰²⁾. His general disillusion with Jaurès is expressed in the Apologie of 1910, where he reviews the events of the Dreyfus Affair, which leads him to the conclusion that the moral values of the Dreyfusards were compromised by Jaurès, who used the Affair to affect a change in society⁽¹⁰³⁾. Referring to the Apologie in Peguy et Les Cahiers de la Quinzaine, he says: "sous ma plume, l'affaire Dreyfus avait cessé d'être un événement exceptionnel, impeccable, sacré"⁽¹⁰⁴⁾

Halévy shared Jaurès' ideals, especially the "L'idéologie généreuse et un peu vague de Jaurès"⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ which he acknowledges in the Essais sur le mouvement ouvrier en France, but this did not extend to support for Jaurès' political actions. Consequently his socialism resembles that of Tocqueville, who demanded dignity and freedom, but refused centralisation and tyranny⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. This in turn accounts for Halévy's interest in syndicalism, since as Alain Silvera argues, "syndicalism alone places the greatest value on individual freedom"⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. He took a serious interest in Proudhon, because mutualism dispensed with the State and authoritarianism⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. This last point was particularly important to him, and in the Essais sur le mouvement ouvrier en France, he quotes Proudhon's view that "l'homme ne veut plus qu'on l'organise, qu'on le mécanise"⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. Halévy was also impressed by the fact that Proudhon's socialism was rooted in French tradition⁽¹¹⁰⁾. His other heroes Péguy and Sorel are not unlike Proudhon in this respect: all three are moralists and represent "an indigenous French socialism based on popular morality...(and) the value of labour"⁽¹¹¹⁾. With respect to Sorel, it is not the emphasis on violence that attracted Halévy, but his revolutionary syndicalism with its debt to Nietzsche.

Alain Silvera states that

"The moral superiority that Nietzsche associated with elites put Halévy in the proper frame of mind to appreciate the full significance of Sorel's myth of the general strike as the indispensable basis for moral regeneration. For both these philosophers had stressed the idea that since conscience is always an individual thing, the greatest happiness can be identified only with the strongest, the most heroic personality"⁽¹¹²⁾.

As far as Halévy's view of Péguy is concerned, in Péguy et les Cahiers de la Quinzaine he presents Péguy as someone who

understood revolution as "une transfiguration...des instincts de l'homme"⁽¹¹³⁾. He therefore appreciates that Péguy "ne voulait pas qu'on restreignît le socialisme à un mouvement de classe"⁽¹¹⁴⁾. Furthermore he realises that Péguy's patriotism is a necessary consequence of his moral conception of revolution:

"Révolutionnaire, il (Péguy) voulait le peuple grand ...Le patriotisme de Péguy...c'est l'amour militant d'une terre honoré en ses plus humbles êtres... Mais seront-ils grands, ces humbles êtres, et honorés, si la terre qui les porte est soumise à des volontés étrangères? Peuple et patrie ne se séparent pas, quoi qu'en disent les doctrinaires de la révolution prolétarienne"⁽¹¹⁵⁾

When Guéhenno came to write Caliban parle in 1928, the view that revolution is concerned with the moral transformation of Man, a view which Halévy found in Péguy, was wholeheartedly accepted by him.

The question of Halévy's influence on Guéhenno is complicated by the fact that their personal relationship was strained. In La Foi difficile he recalls feeling a mixture of admiration and revulsion for Halévy's house⁽¹¹⁶⁾ on the Ile de la Cité⁽¹¹⁷⁾. Mme. Halévy found Guéhenno's hatred of luxury and "fidélité au peuple"⁽¹¹⁸⁾ amusing, since it did not prevent him making use of Halévy's hospitality and frequently staying overnight at the house⁽¹¹⁹⁾. Although Guéhenno is adamant that "nous n'avions rien en commun" (F.D. p.90), he adopted the view which Halévy found in Péguy, that revolution is concerned with the moral, and not solely economic, transformation of man. The belief expressed in 1997-2007, that "material prosperity can corrupt the proletariat"⁽¹²⁰⁾, was something Guéhenno knew from personal experience⁽¹²¹⁾. Halévy's understanding of socialism was also

shared by Guéhenno. Both took the view that it should lead to dignity not tyranny, dignity being understood as freedom for the individual. Consequently Guéhenno like Halévy, admired both Barrès and Jaurès. Another important aspect of Halévy's socialism was his stress on its French indigenous character, and this is later emphasised in Guéhenno's work, notably in Jeunesse de la France. Halévy's work also represents a stylistic influence on Guéhenno's biographical writing. Halévy's biographies are often autobiographies, as they express his own ideas, rather than those of the author under consideration⁽¹²²⁾. This is a criticism later made in relation to Guéhenno's first major published work L'Évangile éternel.

Finally, there is the important question of Halévy's influence on Guéhenno's attitude towards Nietzsche. Halévy's interest in Nietzsche⁽¹²³⁾ led him to become a major authority on the philosopher, and to publish the first French translation of Der Fall Wagner, as well as a translation of Also sprach Zarathustra⁽¹²⁴⁾. His study of Nietzsche published for the review Le Banquet was a pioneering work⁽¹²⁵⁾, and was followed by a major biography⁽¹²⁶⁾. Halévy concentrated on Nietzsche's personal tragedy and presented him as a great socialist, because for Halévy socialism meant ennobling the individual, which was Nietzsche's aim. He also praised Nietzsche's desire to liberate the individual from mediocrity, as well as his attempt to reconcile traditional culture and moral progress⁽¹²⁷⁾. The pre-1914 socialist view of Nietzsche put forward by Halévy, who sought in Nietzsche a method of attaining "la noblesse de l'homme", is adopted by Guéhenno. Even in his last work Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs, he praises Nietzsche for defending the individual and

calling for spiritual self-improvement, thereby following Halévy's example: "si dans la plus humaine des sociétés chacun restera toujours un individu à sauver de lui-même...aurons-nous toujours besoin d'apprendre de Nietzsche"(D.L.D.P. p.68). This is because "(Nietzsche)n'avait souci que d'augmenter en nous la vie" (D.L.D.P. p.71).

When Halévy invited Guéhenno to his salon, he brought him into contact with a large number of the literary elite⁽¹²⁸⁾. Halévy's numerous contacts ensured that the salon was well attended: in the years 1925-1927 Lucie Mazaauric recalls Louis Guilloux, André Malraux, André Chamson, André Gide and Roger Martin du Gard being among the guests⁽¹²⁹⁾, but Julien Benda, Gabriel Marcel, François Mauriac, Abel Bonnard and Jacques-Emile Blanche were also regular attenders⁽¹³⁰⁾. The salon was male dominated⁽¹³¹⁾ and exclusive, which led Guéhenno to the view that the "République des Lettres" was an inaccessible world, where the literary debate was conducted among only a very small number of writers⁽¹³²⁾. In his opinion "le vrai débat" took place within a small circle, which did not necessarily include the most famous writers⁽¹³³⁾. Nevertheless Guéhenno found "la culture même" at Halévy's salon⁽¹³⁴⁾, and became a regular guest, commuting from Lille at weekends⁽¹³⁵⁾.

The literary debates which took place at Halévy's salon not only enlightened Guéhenno in literary matters, but also gave him an opportunity to make new friends. Alain Decaux states that "chez Daniel Halévy, Guéhenno s'est lié avec des hommes un peu plus jeunes que lui, mais qui pensent comme lui: Guilloux, Chamson, Grenier, Malraux, Drieu, Berl"⁽¹³⁶⁾. This is confirmed by Lucie Mazaauric⁽¹³⁷⁾ and by Guéhenno himself: "J'ai dû beaucoup...

à des camarades un peu plus jeunes que moi, qui m'adoptèrent en quelque sorte, dans les années 20, à mon retour de la guerre... Il y avait Guilloux...Grenier...Blanzat...Dabit...Chamson... Giono...Berl...Malraux" (C.D.V.E. pp.158-160). Louis Guilloux, "qui méritait si bien son nom breton de "petit diable", fils de cordonnier comme moi et qui avait connu les mêmes misères, grand lecteur des romans russes, intéressé par les ténèbres de "l'esprit souterrain""(C.D.V.E. p.159), became a close friend⁽¹³⁸⁾ in 1927, when Guéhenno was instrumental in the publication of La maison du peuple⁽¹³⁹⁾ in Halévy's Les Cahiers Verts series for Grasset. As a mark of his gratitude Guilloux later dedicated Compagnons to Guéhenno⁽¹⁴⁰⁾. Eugène Dabit was another close friend:

"Il y eut le bon Dabit, le Parisien du canal Saint-Martin, de l'Hôtel du Nord, que ses souvenirs des tranchées remplissaient d'angoisse, qui avait cherché...les moyens de communication fraternelle, qui...se demandait avec une tendre humilité...si "nos petites histoires à nous "pouvaient aussi intéresser, et qui, plein d'oeuvres encore, s'en alla trouver en Russie... la mort, qui depuis la guerre, n'avait cessé de le hanter" (C.D.V.E. p.159).

When Dabit died in 1936, Guéhenno wrote an article on him, where he stated that what he admired most in Dabit was "un artiste qui continuait de vivre comme un ouvrier"⁽¹⁴¹⁾ André Chamson, a friend since 1925⁽¹⁴²⁾ shared Guéhenno's ideas. Lucie Mazauric, Chamson's wife, remembers that the interests of all three were similar, so conversation centred on such topics as humanism, culture, war and the social conditions of the masses⁽¹⁴³⁾. At the time of the Front Populaire Chamson was to invite Guéhenno to direct Vendredi. Lucie Mazauric recalls that in the years 1925-1928 Guéhenno was a humanist concerned with culture, who loved discussions⁽¹⁴⁴⁾.

When the Chamsons visited him, the evenings would be devoted to serious conversation, but would always end with singing⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. Jean Giono, like Guéhenno and Guilloux "fils de cordonnier, un peu menteur parce qu'il faut bien quelquefois mentir pour qu'on ait du plaisir", was "joyeux comme son soleil, rusé et gai...et vous faisait de si merveilleux contes en tournant, sur sa terrasse... un ailloli" (C.D.V.E. pp.159-160). Believing that "literary, imaginative freedom (was) the only genuine liberty left to contemporary man", he loved telling lies⁽¹⁴⁶⁾, but was entirely serious on the matter of pacifism. Guéhenno later published his "Refus d'obéissance", in Europe in November 1934. Jean Grenier, a friend of Guilloux⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ is described by Guéhenno as "hanté par les grèves où l'on se perd et soucieux de toujours retrouver le vrai chemin des hommes" (C.D.V.E. p.159). Grenier was also a teacher, his most famous pupil being Albert Camus⁽¹⁴⁸⁾, who later became a friend of Guéhenno's. The most renowned of Guéhenno's friends at this time was André Malraux:

"un peu énigmatique, dont on ne connaissait pas le pays mais qui pouvait être de partout. Il y avait en lui de l'aventurier, et cela gênait un peu" (C.D.V.E. p.160).

Malraux was moreover the most famous visitor at Halévy's salon⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. Emmanuel Berl, one of Guéhenno's many Jewish friends, was perhaps best known for his romantic entanglements⁽¹⁵⁰⁾, but Guéhenno also notes "l'extraordinaire mouvement de son esprit, cette sorte de jeu voltairien qu'il jouait autour des idées...cette façon qu'il avait de s'amuser et de nous amuser des choses les plus graves" (C.D.V.E. p.160). This is a much more sympathetic view than that put forward by Lucie Mazauric, who remembers only that Berl lived

well and frequently changed his wives⁽¹⁵¹⁾. Guéhenno has little to say about Jean Paulhan, who became editor of La Nouvelle Revue Française in 1925⁽¹⁵²⁾, except that he was a friend at this time⁽¹⁵³⁾. He is more forthcoming on the subject of Jean Blanzat, who was a close friend of his throughout his life⁽¹⁵⁴⁾. He remembers him at Halévy's as being "tendre et cruel comme ceux qui savent, qui lisait mieux qu'aucun d'entre nous les paysages de la terre et les visages des hommes, et qui parlait mieux que personne d'une feuille d'arbre, du clair d'une fontaine..." (C.D.V.E. p.159).

Guéhenno's relationship with Drieu La Rochelle however, was less straightforward. He initially regarded him as a friend⁽¹⁵⁵⁾, met him frequently at a café on the Ile St. Louis, and admired the fact that Drieu "s'est engagé jusqu'à la mort" (F.D. p.47). Nevertheless he also saw Drieu as typical of a whole generation of bourgeois youth, which, being rich and influenced by Nietzsche before 1914, now wanted a repetition of the conflict of 1914-1918, as it felt that greatness was to be found in war⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. In an undated letter Guéhenno drew attention to the increasing gulf between them, reminding Drieu that although they were close in 1919 on such issues as peace, war and Europe, "(ils plaçaient) autrement (leurs) espérances"⁽¹⁵⁷⁾. Halévy's salon was also the place where Guéhenno met Julien Benda⁽¹⁵⁸⁾, the author of La Trahison des clercs and a regular guest at Halévy's⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. He recalls that "j'avais pour lui de l'estime et de l'admiration. Sa Trahison des clercs me paraissait un grand livre" (D.L.D.P. p.30). The last of the guests remembered by Guéhenno was Anna de Noailles, who once gave him a signed photograph of herself which he kept throughout his life⁽¹⁶⁰⁾. What united all of Guéhenno's friends

was a profound disappointment in post 1918 society. They were like Guéhenno himself, "furieux de voir que le monde a si mal tourné depuis la guerre, de voir que les politiques ont "rendu l'Europe impossible au moment même où il eût fallu la créer""⁽¹⁶¹⁾. They were also soon to find themselves collaborating on the review Europe, which Romain Rolland persuaded Guéhenno to edit⁽¹⁶²⁾.

As well as introducing Guéhenno to the literary elite, Halévy also took a personal interest in him, involving him in Grasset's publication Les Cahiers Verts, of which he was director in the years 1921-1927⁽¹⁶³⁾. This, "the most celebrated publishing venture of 1918-1939"⁽¹⁶⁴⁾, was inspired by Péguy's Cahiers de la Quinzaine⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ which was the focus for politically committed writing before 1914⁽¹⁶⁶⁾. Halévy found a part of Péguy in Guéhenno, Robert Garric and A. Dandieu⁽¹⁶⁷⁾, and attracted them to Les Cahiers Verts⁽¹⁶⁸⁾. He also succeeded in publishing works by important writers, some of whom were just beginning their literary careers. Those whose work was published in Les Cahiers Verts in the 1920's included Julien Benda, Pierre Drieu La Rochelle, Jean Giraudoux, Emmanuel Berl, André Chamson, André Malraux, Charles Maurras, Alfred Fabre-Luce, Gabriel Marcel, François Mauriac, Henry de Montherlant, Jean Giono, Paul Morand and Albert Thibaudet⁽¹⁶⁹⁾, as well as Guéhenno, Garric and Dandieu. Guéhenno's collaboration with Halévy in the selection of works for publication resulted in Louis Guilloux's La Maison du peuple appearing in Les Cahiers Verts in 1927⁽¹⁷⁰⁾. Another publishing venture of Grasset's that Guéhenno collaborated on was Les Écrits, which he created with Dagens⁽¹⁷¹⁾. Originally Grasset wanted this to be a series of ideological and political works, with Albert Thibaudet as

editor⁽¹⁷²⁾, but it became Guéhenno's and Halévy's responsibility. In a letter of 1927, Thibaudet recalls that they asked him to write La République des professeurs for Les Écrits⁽¹⁷³⁾. Whilst in charge of Les Écrits Guéhenno also helped his former classmate from the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, the populist writer André Thérive, Having revived their acquaintance at Halévy's salon in 1926⁽¹⁷⁴⁾, he published Thérive's Sans âme in Les Écrits, for which he was later rewarded with several reviews of his own work throughout the 1930s.

It is as the publisher of Guéhenno's major works that Halévy's role in relation to him is most critical. When writers with whom Guéhenno was acquainted refused to help, Halévy alone wrote to his friend and offered his services⁽¹⁷⁵⁾. As director of Les Cahiers Verts he was able to ensure publication of L'Évangile éternel; hence, in 1927, Guéhenno's first book, a study of Michelet, appeared in the series, with a dedication to his father Jean-Marie Guéhenno⁽¹⁷⁶⁾. It was not Guéhenno's first attempt to deal with Michelet's life, as he recalls that soon after the war "mes maîtres me pressaient d'écrire une thèse. C'était, en ce temps - là un travail de maçon appliqué... Ma plus grande faute était d'aimer Michelet" (E.E. Préface de 1962 p.4). Guéhenno's approach was to seek support in Michelet's work for the beliefs which he still professed, but which the war had undermined:

"Surtout j'avais besoin pour vivre de croire encore à mon pays, et par delà, de croire encore aux hommes... J'étais un "rescapé". Nous croyions encore en la vérité, et qu'elle était faite par l'homme et pour l'homme... Je m'étais donc mis à chercher passionnément dans Michelet la vérité de l'homme, de "l'homme éternel", comme lui-même aimait à dire" (E.E. Préface de 1962 p.4).

Such an approach to Michelet is clearly highly personal and makes the evaluation of him a subjective one. Guéhenno however, makes no attempt to hide the fact that his book: "n'est rien qu'une méditation partielle de quelques-unes de ses idées" (E.E. Prologue p.2). That Guéhenno should make this statement of intent is important, because it immediately dispenses with the criticism that he ignores substantial areas of Michelet's thought. Edmund Wilson in his essay on Michelet in To the Finland Station, stresses Michelet's emphasis on the relativity of character⁽¹⁷⁷⁾, and notes that Michelet was a nationalist who could not distinguish between the cause of the workers and that of France⁽¹⁷⁸⁾. There is little awareness of these problems in L'Évangile éternel, but as Guéhenno himself says: "mon dessein n'est pas d'écrire une biographie" (E.E. p.85). His intention is to define his own beliefs using Michelet as a basis, which is why his book is a selective account of Michelet's thought, where it is often difficult to separate Michelet's ideas from those of the author.

In L'Évangile éternel Guéhenno emphasises the subjective nature of his approach to Michelet at the outset, by drawing biographical parallels between himself and Michelet. Nevertheless his real interest focusses on a limited number of Michelet's concerns and ideas, which are important to him because they represent his own preoccupations. He therefore presents Michelet as a moralist, exploring in detail the ideas of universality and egalitarianism. More importantly, however, Guéhenno looks to Michelet for a solution to the problem of social cohesion posed by the aftermath of the First World War.

He draws a parallel between the social consequences of the "death of God" in the nineteenth century and those of the post-war era, which is why he stresses those aspects of Michelet's thought for which Michelet is indebted to the Italian writer Giambattista Vico. Through the Vican heritage Guéhenno outlines a solution to the problem of social cohesion by arguing that all individuals share a common "core" of thoughts, desires and instincts, which can serve as a basis for social laws as well as a contractual society. The essential feature of Guéhenno's presentation of the Vican Michelet is however that the individual is left free to pursue a moral goal of spiritual perfection. As an intellectual, Guéhenno is naturally concerned with the problem of culture, and this is why in L'Évangile éternel he proceeds to discuss the problem in some depth. Guéhenno's chief difficulty is resolving the divorce between intellectual culture and the masses, which he sees as a threat to all culture: "quels périls ne court pas la culture en ce divorce de la science et du peuple? Car le peuple finira bien par fonder l'ordre" (E.E. p.219). In Michelet he finds an awareness of the "divorce" and the all-important concept of "moi-humanité". This offers a model which an intellectual who is concerned with making culture relevant to the masses can adopt, and in his inter-war works Guéhenno makes this model his own. As a result, in L'Évangile éternel, Michelet is presented primarily as an intellectual hero-figure who succeeded in uniting his thought with the desires of the masses, and therefore wrote books which put forward the essential concerns of a wider humanity.

In the first few pages of L'Évangile éternel Guéhenno gives the clear impression that what initially attracted him to Michelet

were the biographical parallels between them. His description of Michelet's adolescence unmistakably recalls his own life in Fougères:

"un enfant pauvre étudie dans une chambre.
Une merveilleuse ardeur l'anime...
Naïvement il associe... l'humanité à
ses progrès... Le voilà boursier de
collège... Et déjà il n'est plus peuple
naturellement; il se contraint pour
l'être" (E.E. p.15).

Furthermore Guéhenno's view that Michelet's recollections of his poor childhood were a constant factor in his thought⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ is equally applicable to himself.

Nevertheless Guéhenno's primary interest in Michelet lies in several specific ideas which he finds in Michelet's work and which he later adopts in his own books, notably in Caliban parle. He is impressed by Michelet's concern with moral problems, believing that "(Michelet) réclame une réforme intellectuelle et morale, mais plus encore morale qu'intellectuelle" (E.E. p.172). He also admires Michelet's interest in spiritual values, an interest which he had earlier discovered at the École Normale Supérieure in the work of Nietzsche: "La même préoccupation de l'ennoblissement de l'homme, le même désir d'exalter son énergie et son courage, à trente ans d'intervalle, commanda la pensée de Nietzsche et celle de Michelet" (E.E. p.189). For Guéhenno Michelet is therefore a writer, "qui (pensait) refaire à l'homme de XIX^e siècle une vie intérieure" (E.E. p.181). As well as a reaffirmation of the importance of spiritual values, Guéhenno discovers in Michelet a belief in universality, which overshadows any awareness of the nationalistic tendencies in this author. He reiterates Michelet's

view that: "la patrie est l'initiation à l'universelle patrie" (E.E. p.153) and claims that Michelet rejected the religious doctrine of grace, because: "il (voulait) un Dieu qui sauve tous les hommes" (E.E. p.118). Equally importantly Guéhenno sees Michelet's work as an expression of egalitarianism: "'Plus d'élus". C'est ici, je le crois, l'instinct le plus profond et le plus fort de Michelet. Il commande sa pensée politique aussi bien que sa pensée religieuse" (E.E. p.119). He is convinced that "(Michelet) portait au coeur un... douloureux désir de faire participer tous les siens aux biens qu'il possédait lui-même" (E.E. p.23), and that: "il ne pensait pas que le développement de l'humanité pût se faire par un petit nombre d'hommes éclairés et satisfaits, poursuivant en paix leurs spéculations" (E.E. p.212).

Most significant, however, is Guéhenno's admission in the prologue, that his purpose in studying Michelet is to find a solution to the problems of social cohesion⁽¹⁸⁰⁾, because this affects his whole approach in L'Évangile éternel. For Michelet social cohesion becomes problematic as a result of the decline in religious belief, a fact which Guéhenno acknowledges when he states that: "(les hommes) détruisaient une Église, mais cherchaient Dieu... les vieilles religions étant mortes, il fallait découvrir pour les hommes un nouveau principe d'union" (E.E. pp.27-28). Nonetheless, Guéhenno himself claims that the modern cause of this problem is the experience of the First World War:

"Ah, si cinq années de vie commune allaient nous avoir fait en quelque manière une âme commune. Étrange école. Et pourtant qui sait si certains n'y ont pas fait leurs "humanités?" Un sentiment nouveau les domine: ils "coexistent" et les problèmes que leur pose cette co-existence passent avant tous les autres" (E.E. Prologue pp.1-2).

Since this is the major issue which Guéhenno seeks to resolve in L'Évangile éternel, he is particularly interested in Michelet's debt to Giambattista Vico's Scienza Nuova, because this is where he finds a solution to the problem. Edmund Wilson takes the view that Michelet's solution to the problem of social cohesion is naïve and unconvincing - amounting to a plea that all men should love each other⁽¹⁸¹⁾, but this is certainly not the view of Guéhenno. He believes that in Vico Michelet found an "apologie du sens commun" (E.E. p.53), which enabled him to put forward a contractual view of society, and Guéhenno himself later uses a similar argument in Caliban parle. Guéhenno is impressed with the idea of a "sens humain" - otherwise known as the "sens commun", which is shared by all individuals and which can therefore serve as a basis for social laws. The existence of a common "core" in all men means that revolution can also be seen as originating in the individual will, rather than being the product of ideology: "La Révolution... n'est pas selon Michelet, un mouvement idéologique, une victoire de la raison pure; elle est sortie de l'instinct du peuple" (E.E. p.129).

In L'Évangile éternel Guéhenno consciously makes Michelet's views on the "sens commun" and on revolution his own. Concluding his discussion of Michelet in the epilogue, he presents the "sens commun" as the basis of all social ideas: "Soyons sûrs que si les idées doivent mener le monde encore, c'est à la condition qu'elles soient d'accord avec le sens commun de l'humanité" (E.E. pp.220-221). Although Guéhenno believes that in the ideas of Vico and Michelet on the subject of the "sens commun" he has found a new foundation for social rules and a solution to the problem of how an individual relates to others, critics of L'Évangile éternel had reservations

about this argument. Robert Kemp, reviewing Guéhenno's book for La Liberté, questions the advisability of grounding social ideas in a "core" which even if it is shared by all individuals, nevertheless includes instincts which are by definition irrational and unpredictable: "à quelles sottises peut entraîner...la croyance au consentement universel?"⁽¹⁸²⁾. J. Ernest-Charles in his article on L'Évangile éternel for La Dépêche Coloniale, points to another weakness in the argument concerning the "sens commun", when he questions the title of Guéhenno's book. His view that it may be an "Évangile", but that it is certainly not eternal⁽¹⁸³⁾, draws attention to the fact that no proof is offered that the ideas and desires which make up the "sens commun" remain constant through time.

Guéhenno is under no illusions that Michelet's account of Vico provides anything more than a subjective viewpoint. Indeed, he accepts that: "dans Vico...il ne découvrit guère que ce qui était déjà sa foi; il n'en retint que ce qui était conforme à son propre génie" (E.E. p.49), and that: "il négligea dans la Science Nouvelle ce qui était métaphysique, ne vit en elle qu'une admirable méditation sur l'ensemble de l'histoire des hommes" (E.E. p.51). Nevertheless the importance which Guéhenno attaches to the Vican element in Michelet's thought is significant. Edmund Wilson, an American contemporary of Guéhenno's, claims that this aspect of Michelet leads onto the materialist dialectic of Marx and Engels. He believes that Vico is important to Michelet because:

"he enabled him to grasp fully for the first time the organic character of human society and the importance of re-integrating through history the various forces and factors which actually compose human life"(184).

For Wilson, Michelet is primarily a resurrection of Vico which is later taken up by Marx. For Guéhenno, however, Michelet and Vico are above all the authors of the model of the "sens commun", whose essential feature is that each individual remains free to seek personal spiritual perfection.

Since he is interested in preserving a spiritual life and regards Michelet as a moralist, Guéhenno is naturally concerned with the problem of culture posed in Michelet's work. He praises Michelet for an awareness of the "divorce" between intellectual culture and the masses, which he regards as "le grand fait nouveau de ce siècle, le plus tragique" (E.E. p.219). Guéhenno's views on the problem of culture are not fully developed until Caliban parle, but it is worth noting that in L'Évangile éternel his presentation of Michelet's arguments on culture anticipates the later work, because he concentrates mainly on those ideas which he later makes his own. Guéhenno presents culture as a barrier between intellectuals and the masses, drawing attention to Michelet's life-long regret that he was "trop perverti par la culture pour écrire des livres auxquels l'homme de commun (pourrait) se plaire" (E.E. p.16). He is also especially glad to find in Michelet's work a definition of "ce qu'on pourrait appeler un humanisme plébéien, par opposition à l'humanisme aristocratique qui domine notre culture" (E.E. p.133). Nevertheless, in L'Évangile éternel Michelet is above all hailed as an intellectual

hero who invented the concept of "moi-humanité". For Guéhenno this idea of an intellectual whose work conforms to the "sens commun" and is therefore relevant to all men, provides a model which he tries to realise in his own life, especially during the euphoric period of "engagement" at the time of the Front Populaire. There is moreover no doubt that he sees this model as a practical goal and not just an ideal, because he claims that Michelet achieved this ambition. Referring to Michelet's life Guéhenno states: "on y reconnaîtra sans peine l'histoire du XIX^e siècle lui-même" (E.E. p.85), and adds: "son esprit est-il comme un point de conscience de l'humanité" (E.E. p.96).

Bearing in mind that Guéhenno makes it very clear in the prologue that he does not intend to write a conventional biography, it is surprising that Robert Kemp criticised L'Évangile éternel as if it were an academic work: "(l'oeuvre) paraisse, sur tant de points incomplet et superficiel"(185). Most critics however accepted that the book was not so much a work on Michelet, as an expression of Guéhenno's own ideas. André Billy described it as L'Oeuvre as "une profession de foi d'un jeune écrivain"(186). Albert Thibaudet, reviewing L'Évangile éternel for Candide claimed that:

"il ne semble pas que M. Guéhenno ait pris Michelet comme objet d'une étude purement désintéressée mais bien qu'il l'ait considéré à la manière de ce que Barrès dans Un Homme Libre appelle les intercesseurs... (Michelet) a réalisé des modèles... que cherche à prolonger... l'auteur"(187).

Because Guéhenno's view of Michelet is selective and concentrates on those aspects of Michelet which he agrees with, L'Évangile éternel is correctly seen by critics as an excessively positive account of him. Robert Kemp describes it as "un travail pieux"⁽¹⁸⁸⁾, a viewpoint which is shared by André Billy⁽¹⁸⁹⁾. J. Ernest-Charles notes that Guéhenno meditates on Michelet with "une persistance passionnée", with the result that his book is full of love⁽¹⁹⁰⁾. Guéhenno himself is frank about his admiration for Michelet and restates his debt to this writer throughout his life. In La Foi difficile of 1957 he claims Michelet's thought as his own⁽¹⁹¹⁾, whilst in Dernières lumières, Derniers plaisirs of 1977, he says that "c'était lui qui m'avait mis sur le chemin. Je me remettais et marcherais sous ses auspices" (D.L.D.P. p.22). Guéhenno recalls that he took a great interest in Michelet's ideas of "Dignité individuelle" and "Généralité sociale", because: "sauver à la fois le principe aristocratique et celui de l'égalité des chances, ce fut bien là toujours mon problème" (D.L.D.P. p.23). His approach in L'Évangile éternel clearly invokes the biographies of Daniel Halévy, whose "choice of biographical subjects gave him the opportunity of conveying the essence of his own liberal convictions by identifying them with historical characters"⁽¹⁹²⁾. This view of Alain Silvera is particularly appropriate to the biography of Nietzsche, which Halévy published in 1907⁽¹⁹³⁾.

There is no doubt that in L'Évangile éternel Guéhenno is using the format of a study of Michelet to put across his own ideas. In effect he is using Michelet in exactly the same way as he believes Michelet uses Vico. His account is selective, and he largely ignores Michelet's nationalism as well as his

ambiguity on the question of atheism. Guéhenno's concerns are primarily moral, but in L'Évangile éternel he also seeks a solution to the problems of human coexistence, which have become acute in a world without God that is moreover recovering from a World War. The solution which Michelet finds in Vico and which Guéhenno makes his own, proposes a contractual society based on factors common to all men - the "sens commun". Since in L'Évangile éternel Guéhenno places great emphasis on Michelet's pre-occupation with preserving spirituality, culture necessarily becomes a matter of urgency for him, because an enlightened society is only possible if the masses make the enlightened values of philosophers their own. Both Michelet and Guéhenno are concerned that the ordinary man and the cultural elite have become separated, which poses the danger of a new barbarism, and both call for culture to be relevant to the masses. This concern with relevance, as well as the exposition of Michelet's argument on "moi-humanité" clearly prefigures the call for "engagement" and the endorsement of the "intellectuel engagé", which is to be found in Guéhenno's inter-war work, beginning with Caliban parle. Furthermore L'Évangile éternel anticipates Caliban parle, since Guéhenno is unwilling to present his ideas through a first person narrative. In general terms, this first work also prefigures Guéhenno's later texts, as the argument describing how the individual relates to society is never subsequently renounced. Finally the choice of a nineteenth-century figure as a subject for a first work is particularly revealing, because it suggests that from the outset Guéhenno associated himself with nineteenth-century ideas.

The frequent trips to Paris, made necessary by his involvement in Halévy's publishing ventures, as well as the fact that he now had friends there, persuaded Guéhenno to return to Paris permanently in the autumn of 1927. He found accommodation at 28, rue Emile Desvaux in the XIX^e arrondissement⁽¹⁹⁴⁾, and took up the post of Professeur de seconde at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand⁽¹⁹⁵⁾. Guéhenno spent two years in this Lycée, where he himself had been a student in 1910-1911. In his second year there as teacher, he gained promotion to the post of Professeur de première⁽¹⁹⁶⁾.

Guéhenno's permanent presence in Paris brought him to the attention of Paul Desjardins, who first heard of Guéhenno through Gabriel Marcel⁽¹⁹⁷⁾. Paul Desjardins invited Guéhenno to visit him and was immediately impressed with his manner. Recalling the day, the 8th December 1927, he notes that "le principal (événement de la journée) a été l'entrevue avec Jean Guéhenno. C'est mon homme, il est du peuple, un nouveau Péguy"⁽¹⁹⁸⁾. The impression Guéhenno made earned him an invitation to Paul Desjardin's Décades, the annual literary seminars, held at the Abbaye de Pontigny, since 1912⁽¹⁹⁹⁾. The seminars, first attended by Guéhenno in the 1920s⁽²⁰⁰⁾, were pioneered by André Gide, Jacques Copeau and Jean Schlumberger - men who were also involved in the early years of the Nouvelle Revue Française. Paul Desjardins himself was, like Guéhenno, a former student of the École Normale Supérieure, and he was also a Dreyfusard hostile to the Church. Nevertheless his personal attitudes were not reflected in his choice of guests, or even by the names on the board of the Pontigny Conseil d'administration. This administration included Léon Brunschvicg, Roger Martin du Gard, André Maurois, André Siegfried, Jean Schlumberger and the catholic convert Charles Du Bos⁽²⁰¹⁾.

The guests represented an even greater range of opinion.

Those invited to Pontigny in the 1920s included André Chamson, Jacques Heurgon, Edith Wharton, Walter Barry, Lytton Strachey, Jean Prévost, Alfred Fabre-Luce, Ramon Fernandez, Jean Fayard, André Maurois, François Mauriac, Jean Guéhenno, Bernard Groethuysen, André Malraux and Marcel Arland, who persuaded the guests to sign a petition demanding Malraux's release, during the Indochina statues affair⁽²⁰²⁾. André Chamson recalls the ten day long seminar held in 1928, when he became acquainted with André Malraux and Jean Giono. Among those present he recalls Gide, Martin du Gard, and Schlumberger, remembered by the younger writers as "les dieux de notre jeunesse"⁽²⁰³⁾. André Chamson also claims that Desjardins hated arguments: "il voulait que les gens s'entendent toujours chez-lui"⁽²⁰⁴⁾. Albert Thibaudet, however, who was also a guest at Pontigny, recalls it as a place of dialogue⁽²⁰⁵⁾, and notes the spiritual "Cistercian" aspects of the charter of Desjardin's Union Pour l'Action Morale⁽²⁰⁶⁾.

Whereas the Pontigny seminars were an annual event, Paul Desjardin's Paris-based Union Pour la Vérité, held meetings throughout the year. During the 1920s its meetings were attended by Gallimard, Ramon Fernandez, Jean Paulhan, Bernard Groethuysen, Gabriel Marcel, Benjamin Crémieux, Léon Brunschwig, Julien Benda and Georges Duhamel who once gave a lecture on "Les non-civilisés et nous". In June 1929 André Malraux held a seminar on the moral position of Garine in Les Conquerants. Malraux was a regular guest throughout the inter-war period, and a member of the group of friends which included Guéhenno. The other members of this group were Jean Schlumberger, Saint-Exupéry, Ramon Fernandez,

Andrée Viollis, André Gide, Jean-Pierre Maxence and Thierry Maulnier⁽²⁰⁷⁾. The Right-wing views of the last two do not seem to have worried the Left-wing members of the group. When, in 1935, Malraux spoke on the preface to Le Temps du mépris, Guéhenno gave his support to him, and attacked André Gide for cultivating the differences between people, but this did not prevent all three going for a drink together afterwards⁽²⁰⁸⁾. The general atmosphere at Desjardins's meetings was most agreeable. Desjardins himself recalls "une très belle séance à la rue Visconti. Jean Guéhenno...très sympathique, sincère...parlent Berl, Malraux, Fernandez, Parodi, Benda, Brunschwig, Chamson, Halévy, Du Bos"⁽²⁰⁹⁾. With the help of Desjardins and Halévy, Guéhenno became a regular guest at literary functions and a close acquaintance of famous authors. In May 1929 Desjardins invited the Guéhennoes to Versailles for the commemoration of Albert Thierry by Vial⁽²¹⁰⁾, whilst André Gide, whom Guéhenno admired but frequently disagreed with, often invited him to his flat in the rue Vaneau. The other guests there included André Chamson, Lucie Mazauric and André Malraux. Lucie Mazauric remembers that André Gide always wanted the opinions of others on subjects which interested him. The topics under discussion in 1928 included the Revolution of 1789 which everyone judged severely, and the "deux cents familles", condemned by all present. Guéhenno's passionate belief in equality and fraternity left a memorable impression on Gide's guests. Lucie Mazauric recalls that in the heat of an argument, he would seek to abolish even those natural instances of inequality which cannot be avoided⁽²¹¹⁾.

Although Guéhenno was demobilised in 1919, his rapid withdrawal into self-imposed exile in Lille, suggests that he was not yet emotionally ready to return to civilian life at that time. The inability to come to terms with the experience of war, did however have a positive effect, since it encouraged him to begin serious writing, as a form of therapy. At the same time his decision to become a teacher obliged him to socialise, all be it reluctantly, and to consider the essential aims of the culture which he was giving his students. Nevertheless, Guéhenno could well have remained a provincial professeur de Lycée, had it not been for the influence in his life of Daniel Halévy. Through the discussions at Halévy's salon, Guéhenno once more found himself passionately involved with literary matters, and met writers who soon became his friends. It seems to be more than coincidence that nearly all Guéhenno's surviving correspondence post-dates 1927, and more importantly, that the earliest letters which he wrote to those who were to become life-long friends were all written about this time⁽²¹²⁾. Thanks to Halévy, Guéhenno also experienced his first taste of the publishing world, by becoming involved as an editor of Les Cahiers Verts and Les Écrits. This was to prove useful to him, when he became editor of Europe. But Halévy's key role in relation to Guéhenno is as the man who made possible the publication of his first major texts. The first of these works, L'Évangile éternel, is important, because in it Guéhenno outlines his basic philosophy by drawing heavily on the ideas of Michelet. The view of the contractual society based on the "sens humain", the concern with culture and the call for culture to be relevant to all Men, are all heavily exploited, and later become a permanent

aspect of Guéhenno's work, being present in Caliban parle, Conversion à l'humain, Jeunesse de la France and Journal d'une "Révolution".

By the late 1920s, it is clear that a major change had taken place in Guéhenno's personality. Formerly an ambitious but lonely individualist who since childhood had found it difficult to relate to other people, he was now a sociable man⁽²¹³⁾, who mixed with men of various political persuasions. As a regular guest at Halévy's salon and Desjardins' Décades, Guéhenno's name soon became known in Parisian literary circles, and he could therefore expect a strong critical response from his friends to Caliban parle - the first text where he openly deals with the general question of culture.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

1. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno, by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
2. Evidence for this is provided in Guéhenno's letter to Romain Rolland of the 4th July 1919: "Je suis encore élève à l'École Normale Supérieure". In Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, p.15.
3. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno - Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). Alain Decaux also states that "il a été nommé professeur au Lycée de Douai". See: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.13.
4. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 4th July 1919. In Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, p.15.
5. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 7th July 1919. In ibid., p.15
6. See: Paul Louis, Histoire du socialisme en France 1789-1945. Paris, Librairie Marcel Rivière, 1945, pp.338-339.
7. See: ibid., p.339.
8. See: ibid., p.342.
9. See: ibid., p.346.
10. See: ibid., p.337.
11. See: ibid., p.340.
12. See: ibid., p.343.
13. See: ibid., p.347.
14. See: J. Delperrié de Bayac, Histoire du Front Populaire. Paris, Fayard, 1972, p.19.

15. See: *ibid.*, pp. 19 and 33.
16. See: *ibid.*, p.20.
17. See: *ibid.*, p.20.
18. See: Alfred Spire, Inventaire des Socialismes Français contemporains. Paris, Librairie de Medicis, Éditions Politiques, Economiques et Sociales, 1945. p.180.
19. See: J. Delperrié de Bayac, Histoire du Front Populaire, p.22.
20. See: *ibid.*, p.22.
21. Alain Decaux, Discours... pp.12-13.
22. Especially after leaving Europe. This was stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno on the 15th May 1984.
23. See: David Caute, The Fellow Travellers. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson Limited, 1973. p.203.
24. C & P. p.217. Repeated in C.D.V.E. p.167.
25. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 12th November 1928. In Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, p.31.
26. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno - Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
27. See: F.D. p.23.
28. See: *ibid.*, p.25.
29. See: *ibid.*, p.26.
30. Guéhenno's mother told him: "tu es un bourgeois", See: *ibid.*, p.41.
31. Guéhenno acknowledges that he could not be helped. See: *ibid.*, p.23.
32. "(Après la guerre de 1914-1918) j'ai perdu le goût pour la littérature". *Ibid.*, p.24.

33. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno - Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
34. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno - Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno),
It is also stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
35. This is stated in the unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). See also: Alain Decaux, Discours... p.13: "Il a créé la première khâgne".
36. See: Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, vol.2. p.170.
37. Administration, Law and Medicine were too expensive for poor students to study. See Albert Thibaudet, La République des Professeurs, p.121.
38. See: Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, vol.2. p.228.
39. See: *ibid.*, p.331.
40. See: *ibid.*, p.233.
41. See: *ibid.*, p.236.
42. See: *ibid.*, p.236.
43. See: *ibid.*, p.237.
44. See: *ibid.*, p.240.
45. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.13
46. See: F.D. p.75.
47. For an account of what a professeur de rhétorique taught see: Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, vol.2. p.241.

48. See: F.D. p.76.
49. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.13.
50. Henri Coulet article, in Jean Guéhenno - Extrait de l'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de L'École Normale Supérieure.
51. This is a remark made by Jean Guéhenno, and it is quoted by Alain Decaux in his Discours... p.13.
52. Alain Decaux, Discours... pp.13-14.
53. This was stated in conversation with the author by Prof. Max Milner of the Université de Dijon on the 28th February 1984.
54. This was stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 14th May 1984.
55. Article by Jean-Pierre Richard, in Jean Guéhenno-Extrait de l'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de l'École Normale Supérieure.
56. See: F.D. p.77.
57. See: Article by Jean-Pierre Richard, in Jean Guéhenno - Extrait de l'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de l'École Normale Supérieure.
58. This was stated in conversation with the author by Prof. Max Milner of the Université de Dijon , on the 28th February 1984.
59. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.14.
60. Article by Henri Coulet, in Jean Guéhenno - Extrait de l'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de L'École Normale Supérieure.
61. Article by Jean-Pierre Richard, in Jean Guéhenno - Extrait de l'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de l'École Normale Supérieure.
62. Ibid.

63. Ibid.

64. Article by Jean Deprun, in Jean Guéhenno - Extrait de l'Annuaire des Anciens Élèves de L'École Normale Supérieure.

65. Jean Guéhenno says: "j'ai aimé mon métier". F.D. p.78.

66. See: André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux. Paris, Grasset and Fasquelle, 1984. p.40.

67. This information is give in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Louis Guilloux, of the 14th March 1927. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

68. See: F.D. p.20.

69. See: ibid., p.56.

70. See: ibid., p.20.

71. See: ibid., p.21.

72. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Les relations intellectuelles entre la France et l'Allemagne", La Grande Revue, avril 1922, pp.335-343.

73. "(Guéhenno) collabore dans les années 1920-1927 à la Revue de Paris, à la Grand Revue". This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

74. This was during the years 1923-1931. See bibliography.

75. This is Mme. Annie Guéhenno's view, stated in conversation with the author on the 15th May 1984.

76. See: F.D. p.59.

77. See: ibid., p.60.

78. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 2nd August 1928. In Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, p.20.

79. See: F.D. p.41.
80. See: *ibid.*, p.42.
81. See: *ibid.*, p.35. See also C.àH. p.131, where Guéhenno publishes this letter to Barrès, which he did not send to Barrès at the time.
82. See: F.D. p.34.
83. See: *ibid.*, p.43.
84. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Mesure de la France", par Pierre Drieu La Rochelle", Les Cahiers Verts, Paris, Grasset, 1926.
See also: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 18th September 1930, in Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23. p.128.
85. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.38. See also: Lucie Mazauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie. Paris, Librairie Plon, 1972, p.78, for information that the salon was held on Saturday evenings, thereby enabling Guéhenno to attend regularly. See also: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 18th September 1930, in Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, p.128.
86. André Chamson, whom he met at Halévy's, says they were friends since 1925. See: André Chamson in Hommage à Jean Guéhenno. Paris, Armand Colin, 1962. p.5.
87. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.38.
88. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, Ithaca New York, Cornell University Press, 1966. p.1.
89. See: *ibid.*, p.3.
90. See: *ibid.*, p.5.

91. See: *ibid.*, pp.15-16.
92. See: *ibid.*, p.42.
93. See: *ibid.*, p.44.
94. See: *ibid.*, pp.45-47.
95. See: *ibid.*, p.49.
96. *Ibid.*, p.141.
97. See: *ibid.*, p.143.
98. See: *ibid.*, p.147.
99. See: *ibid.*, p.99.
100. See: *ibid.*, p.92.
101. See: *ibid.*, p.97.
102. See: *ibid.*, p.172.
103. See: *ibid.*, pp.104-105.
104. Daniel Halévy, Péguy et les Cahiers de la Quinzaine, p.192.
105. Daniel Halévy, Essais sur le mouvement ouvrier en France, Paris, Société nouvelle de librairie et d'édition. 1901. p.252.
106. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, p.178.
107. See: *ibid.*, p.179.
108. See: *ibid.*, p.178.
109. Daniel Halévy, Essais sur le mouvement ouvrier en France, p.288.
110. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, p.208.
111. See: *ibid.*, p.226.
112. *Ibid.*, pp.73-74.
113. Daniel Halévy, Péguy et les Cahiers de la Quinzaine, p.137.
114. *Ibid.*, p.254.
115. *Ibid.*, pp.140-141.
116. See: F.D. p.96.
117. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, p.54.

118. See: F.D. p.97.
119. See: *ibid.*, p.95. This is also confirmed by Guéhenno in an unpublished letter to Louis Guilloux, dated the 29th March 1927. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
120. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, p.190.
121. Guéhenno speaks of the effect of education on his relationship with working people: "La vie nous avait séparé,... j'avais perdu la simplicité". F.D. p.40.
122. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, p.209.
123. See: *ibid.*, p.39. See also: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.38, for information that Halévy was very interested in Nietzsche.
124. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, pp.72-73.
125. See: *ibid.*, p.44.
126. See: *ibid.*, p.72.
127. See: *ibid.*, pp.74-76.
128. Herbert R. Lottman claims Guéhenno was introduced to the literary world in Halévy's salon. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.38.
129. See: Lucie Mazauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, pp.72-77.
130. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.38.
131. See: Lucie Mazauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.73.
132. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.25.
133. See: F.D. p.88.
134. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.38.

135. See: Lucie Mazaauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.76.
136. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.14.
137. Lucie Mazaauric says Guéhenno was older than his friends, but the war made him a part of the younger generation.
See: Lucie Mazaauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.76.
138. See: F.D. p.93.
139. Guéhenno published Guilloux's La maison du peuple.
See: Mary Jean Matthews Green, Louis Guilloux - An Artisan of Language. York, South Carolina, French Literature Publishing Co. 1980. p.15.
140. See: Louis Guilloux, Compagnons. Paris, Grasset, 1931.
141. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Un ami", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936, p.11.
142. In 1962 André Chamson refers to Guéhenno as "un ami de 37 ans".
See: Hommage à Jean Guéhenno, p.5.
143. See: Lucie Mazaauric avec Andre Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, pp. 149-150.
144. See: *ibid.*, p.76.
145. See: *ibid.*, pp.149-152.
146. See: Walter Redfern, The private world of Jean Giono. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1967. p.2.
147. See Lucie Mazaauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.36. See also: Mary Jean Matthews Green, Louis Guilloux - An artisan of language, p.12.

148. See: Lucie Mazauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.36.
149. See: André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.43.
150. This was stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 15th May 1984.
151. See: Lucie Mazauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.145.
152. See: *ibid.*, p.41.
153. See: F.D. p.91.
154. Jean Blanzat was Jean Guéhenno's life-long friend. This was stated in conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno, on the 15th May 1984.
155. Guéhenno mentions Drieu La Rochelle as one of his friends at Halévy's salon. See: F.D. p.93.
156. See: F.D. pp.46-49.
157. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Drieu La Rochelle, in Drieu La Rochelle, edited by Marc Hanrez, Paris, Cahiers de l'Herne, 1982. p.376.
158. Guéhenno says that "je le recontrais souvent chez Halévy". D.L.D.P. p.30.
159. See: André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.43. See also: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.38, for information that one of the guests at Halévy's salon was Julien Benda.
160. For information that Guéhenno met Anna de Noailles, see: F.D. p.94. A signed photograph of Anna de Noailles given by her to Guéhenno, is still kept among his papers. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

161. Alain Decaux, Discours... p.14.
162. See for example: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 5th November 1928. In Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, p.30.
163. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, p.199.
164. Ibid., p.48.
165. Ibid., p.212.
166. See: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society, p.358.
167. See: Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, p.130.
168. See: Ibid., p.39.
169. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.39.
170. See: Mary Jean Matthews Green, Louis Guilloux - An artisan of language, p.15.
171. See: Frédéric Lefèvre, "Une heure avec Robert Garric et Jean Guéhenno", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 2 février 1929, p.1.
172. See: Albert Thibaudet, La République des Professeurs, p.37.
173. See: "Lettre à Jean Guéhenno" published in ibid., p.7.
174. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno, of the 18th September 1930. In Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, p.126.
175. See: F.D. p.90.
176. See: E.E. p.V.
177. See: Edmund Wilson, To the Finland Station, London. Collins, Fontana Library, 1962, p.28.
178. See: Ibid., p.36.
179. See: E.E. p.3.
180. See: E.E. p.2.
181. See: Edmund Wilson, To the Finland Station, pp.33-34.

182. Robert Kemp, "L'Évangile éternel", La Liberté, 3 novembre 1927, p.2.
183. J. Ernest-Charles, "Cabotins et humanité (L'Évangile éternel)",
La Dépêche Coloniale, 22 octobre 1927, p.1.
184. Edmund Wilson, To the Finland Station, p.11.
185. Robert Kemp, "L'Évangile éternel", La Liberté, 3 novembre 1927, p.2.
186. André Billy, "Ouvrages divers", L'Oeuvre, 11 octobre 1927, p.4.
187. Albert Thibaudet, "L'Évangile éternel", Candide, 13 octobre 1927.
188. Robert Kemp, "L'Évangile éternel", La Liberté, 3 novembre 1927, p.2.
189. See: André Billy, "Ouvrages divers", L'Oeuvre, 11 octobre 1927, p.4.
190. For this information and source of quotation see: J. Ernest-Charles,
"Cabotins et humanité (L'Évangile éternel)", La Dépêche Coloniale,
22 octobre 1927, p.1.
191. See: F.D. p.65.
192. Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times, p.209.
193. See: *ibid.*, p.209.
194. This information is given in an unpublished letter from
Jean Guéhenno to Louis Guilloux, dated the 18th October 1927.
(In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
195. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno - Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
It is confirmed in the unpublished biographical notes on
Jean Guéhenno by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of
Mme. Annie Guéhenno). It is also confirmed in Alain Decaux,
Discours... p.13: "En 1927 (Guéhenno) est nommé à Paris".
196. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

197. "Gabriel Marcel arrive le premier au rendez-vous, nous parlons de Jean Guéhenno", Agendas de Paul Desjardins, Fichier des noms cités, établie par M. Leleu pour le compte du C.N.R.S.
Entry of the 24th November 1927. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
198. Agendas de Paul Desjardins. Entry of the 8th December 1927.
(In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
199. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.61.
200. For a list of the guests who attended during the 1920s, which includes Guéhenno, see: *ibid.*, p.61. This is also confirmed by Guéhenno in an unpublished letter to Jean-Richard Bloch dated the 2nd August 1929, in : Fonds J.R. Bloch, Papiers J.R. Bloch, Lettres adressées à J.R. Bloch XXII.
Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Francaises.
201. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.60.
202. See: *ibid.*, pp.61-62.
203. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, pp.44-47.
204. *Ibid.*, p.45.
205. See: Albert Thibaudet, La République des Professeurs, p.55.
206. See: *ibid.*, pp.146-147.
207. For information on the Union pour la Vérité, see:
Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.63.
208. This incident is recalled by André Gide's "petite Dame",
and is referred to in *ibid.*, p.63.
209. Agendas de Paul Desjardins, Entry for the 19th January 1929.
(In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
210. This is stated in *ibid.*, Entry for the 9th May 1929.

211. For an account of events at Gide's soirées, see: Lucie Mazaauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, pp. 138-139.
212. Apart from a letter to Romain Rolland, no correspondence exists which is dated earlier than 1927.
- 213 This was stated in conversation with the author by Prof. Max Milner, of the Université de Dijon . . on the 28th February 1984.

Chapter Three

Caliban Parle

Began whilst he was living in Lille⁽¹⁾ and completed in Paris, Guéhenno's Caliban parle is an important text not only because of the interest it aroused when it was first published, but also since it raises issues which dominate his thought throughout his life. Looking back on his literary debut in later years, Guéhenno himself states: "Le titre de l'un de mes premiers livres annonçait toute ma vie: Caliban parle" (C.D.V.E. p.8).

Nonetheless whilst he was working on the book, Guéhenno had problems finishing it, and even considered abandoning it altogether. In a letter to his friend Louis Guilloux he confessed: "le Caliban... ne me contente pas. Je ne sais si je le publierai"⁽²⁾. The ultimate decision to publish owes much to the encouragement and support of Daniel Halévy, which Guéhenno acknowledges in another letter to Guilloux: "Halévy a lu le Caliban. Il m'assure... que c'est bon"⁽³⁾. Halévy moreover offered to help with the publication of the book, at a time when Guéhenno's friends refused to do so⁽⁴⁾, and he also suggested the final title: "Ce fut Daniel Halévy qui, se moquant un jour de mes contradictions et de l'étrangeté de mes propos, me dit: "Caliban parle"...J'avais, pour mon livre, mon titre qui devait étonner et surprendre: Caliban parle"(C.D.V.E. p.158)⁽⁵⁾. Guéhenno recognised his debt to Halévy dedicating the book to him "en témoignage de gratitude et d'affection" (C.P. p.VII). Caliban parle was finally published in November 1928⁽⁶⁾, and provoked many readers to enter into correspondence with the author. In a letter to Guilloux of March 1929 Guéhenno states: "Je continue à recevoir des lettres bien émouvantes à propos du Caliban"⁽⁷⁾

Guéhenno's intention in Caliban parle is to be the mouthpiece of the masses. He achieves this, by using the device of a first person narrative spoken by Caliban, the mythical figure representing the lowest of men, whom he found in the work of Ernest Renan. In L'Évangile éternel culture was presented as an element critical to any discussion of a post-Christian society. It is hardly surprising therefore, that in Caliban parle Guéhenno is not only speaking for the masses, but also attempting to salvage humanist culture.

In Guéhenno's vocabulary, Caliban represents "les "rouges", le peuple des rues" (C.P. p.XX), whose very numbers inspire fear in the affluent class thereby making Caliban indispensable to every revolution: "Je suis l'artisan...des révolutions" (C.P. p.2). Ironically Caliban also finds himself eliminated from the centre of power as soon as the old order has been overthrown. Most importantly for Guéhenno's argument concerning today's Caliban, is the belief that Caliban thinks, and that thanks to his masters he is now aware of his virtues: "Pourquoi...parce qu'on avait besoin de moi (Caliban), m'avoir dit...que, j'étais intelligent, beau, grand, plein de sens et de vertu?" (C.P. p.24).

Having thus defined Caliban, Guéhenno seeks to demonstrate how the legacy of religion and the experience of the First World War bring about an awareness in all individuals of their social similarity. When reinforced by certain spiritual ideals, which originate in religion, this awareness creates the conditions for revolution, but the quality of this revolution is dependent on the level of culture attained by the masses.

Today's Caliban knows that "God is dead", and that religion "n'est plus qu'une vaste administration temporelle" (C.P. p.68). This is at best irrelevant to him, as it calls for an act of faith: "cette foi...ne peut plus se nourrir et se propager que dans leur sommeil... nous ne voulons pas... de ce sommeil" (C.P. pp.75-76). Without faith there can be no religion, and today most men do not believe. Hence religion can no longer be of any social consequence, representing as it does, only a minority attitude.

Although religion as such is dead, the values and needs which it embodied and satisfied, persist. The need to believe still exists, and although the objective is now different, "l'esprit de croisade est en nous" (C.P. p.76). Revolution has replaced religion for Caliban, who is still prepared to make sacrifices, but only in order to achieve an earthly Paradise. The decline in religious belief means that there is no longer any justification for suffering, so revolt becomes as natural as well as a logical reaction.

The most important legacy of religion is the awareness that all men have of spiritual values. Caliban is determined to retain spiritual values in a non-religious world, and is conscious of his spiritual heritage: "J'avais part à la vie spirituelle du monde" (C.P. p.8.). Consequently the goals of revolution cannot be exclusively material: Caliban also wants a just world order, but because it is a spiritual ideal, it can never be fully achieved, since it is always capable of improvement: "La justice (doit) être... en agonie jusqu'à la fin du monde" (C.P. p.115). The view of revolution as a spiritual ideal, means that it becomes

a matter for the individual consciousness. This is why Guéhenno argues in Caliban parle, that "la vraie grandeur de l'homme est en sa vie intérieure" (C.P. p.106).

Whereas the legacy of religion is an awareness of the spirit, the legacy of the First World War is fraternity: "l'angoisse recréait la communion des hommes" (C.P. p.42). The common experience of trench life destroyed the illusions created by school, but at the same time made all the participants aware that their individual destinies were joined together, interchangeable, and that salvation was a common social goal. This all-important awareness of social similarity among so many individuals was certainly highlighted by the war, as it placed everyone in a similar situation, but even in normal social conditions it is obvious that individual Calibans all face similar problems for similar reasons, and that this encourages class solidarity. The view that social action and class solidarity are merely the combined net result of individual self-interest is one of the most important ideas presented in Caliban parle. Every Caliban wants advancement: "qui parle de se surmonter? Nous ne faisons que cela" (C.P. p.112), and all want material luxuries: "Toute ma politique ne serait qu'affaire d'estomac" (C.P. p.12). This is because human appetites are equal: "Eux (les bourgeois) et moi aimons le bon vin" (C.P. p.6.). Caliban's cause is only more just than that of anyone else, since he is part of the largest social group. Therefore each individual Caliban, by acting in his own self interest, is simultaneously acting in the interests of the vast majority of men.

The rise of class consciousness among the masses must lead to a popular revolution, as well as to the establishment of a new

world order based on reason and justice. Reason and justice can become the characteristics of the post-revolutionary order, because Caliban demands them: "nous (Calibans) sommes fidèles à la justice" (C.P. p.114). This is however a hope and an ideal, rather than an inevitable consequence of social revolution, as Guéhenno is dealing here with issues that depend on the degree of spiritual awareness among the masses, for their realisation. In other words, the quality of the revolution which Caliban is about to undertake depends on the level of culture and the cultural values of the masses.

Caliban parle raises the problem of culture and its relationship to the masses, as an element which is complementary to pure class self-interest, in the making of a revolution which is enlightened and respectful of liberal values. It must be appreciated, however, that for Guéhenno culture is a non-political notion: hence his conscious advocacy of the values associated with the bourgeois revolution of 1789 in no sense implies an admission that these values are "bourgeois". The first question that Guéhenno asks is what is the state of culture today? He is forced to conclude that much of what passes for culture is in his view "false" culture. He notes that culture is being compromised by the behaviour of the masters of society who, not content with material domination, seek to represent themselves as spiritual leaders. Secondly, true artists are now prepared to compromise their art, lured by financial gain. Furthermore, the widespread view that culture is the privilege of an elite, and that the very nature of culture implies that it must remain so, serves to alienate the masses from culture. Indeed culture, which is at present in the hands of an elite, poses a danger

to Caliban: "il y a pour nous... dans la culture de nos maîtres, un poison" (C.P. p.36). This is because an elitist conception of culture invites the best Calibans to abandon their roots, thereby depriving the masses as a whole of their best elements.

Having mentioned some blatant corruptions of culture by forces essentially external to it, Guéhenno considers some of the internal difficulties. The cultural élite, represented in Caliban parle by the figure of Prospero, has withdrawn into an ivory tower, leaving Caliban to create a new and barbaric world order, precisely because he has been left to his own devices: The Bolshevik Revolution is given as the first example of such an order. Withdrawal from the world is not in itself treason regarding humanity, but the more extreme self-involvement of the cultural élite does have the effect of making culture as a whole irrelevant to the masses. This is however a very difficult problem to resolve, even with the best will in the world. Guéhenno himself, whilst writing Caliban parle faced the question of style, and he admits to it being a barrier between artists and the masses: "Comment reconnaître en ces pages l'accent de ta voix (Caliban)?" (C.P. p.109). There exist of course those intellectuals who consciously serve society's masters, thereby betraying reason - which they use to justify an unreasonable order, and compromising those of their fellows who wish to help the masses. Knowledge for Guéhenno is only a tool which can serve both good and evil. Consequently, for some intellectuals "la culture n'a d'autre objet que de faire des chefs et de les justifier à la fois" (C.P. p.38).

For all these reasons, despite acknowledging a basic need for reason and justice, Caliban is often scornful of them, and is hostile to present-day culture. Since culture today is often used to justify bourgeois rule, Caliban despairs of culture as a whole: "Quand on ne parle bien que pour me mieux tromper, dois-je respecter cette parlerie?" (C.P. p.30.). Literacy can enslave as well as liberate: "pour un (livre) qui servit à nous sortir de peine, mille ne firent que prolonger notre misère" (C.P. p.29), hence: "Nous ne distinguons plus entre les bibliothèques et les casernes de nos maîtres" (C.P. p.29). The use of reason and spiritual faculties to justify injustice, poses the threat that Caliban will reject reason altogether: "Si l'esprit parfois nous est suspect, que nos maîtres s'en prennent à eux-mêmes! Pourquoi s'appliquent-ils à le déshonorer?" (C.P. p.29). The blame for the "divorce" between culture and the masses is therefore put on everyone but the masses.

Despite all the difficulties, there is a solution to Caliban's apparent and understandable rejection of culture. Guéhenno makes an all-important distinction between pure knowledge, which can serve any purpose, and culture, which he defines as a need for knowledge, truth and justice. Having made this distinction, he is able to argue that "natural" culture is to be found in people with no formal literary culture: "Des milliers d'hommes, sans aucune culture livresque, ont cependant un grand savoir" (C.P. p.45). Guéhenno believes all men are capable of thought and moreover, he suggests that Caliban is better able to appreciate culture than a literate, educated bourgeois. This is because culture for Guéhenno is a need for truth, and only Caliban can see truth clearly, as he has no interests to defend, and therefore has no need for profitable lies.

Guéhenno is convinced that it is only the perversion of culture which Caliban rejects, because all men have the capacity to appreciate culture, if only it is made available to them. Given this conviction, Caliban parle is not only a condemnation of "false culture", but also a plea for culture to be made available to all.

It is clear that Guéhenno's basic concern in Caliban parle is to rescue culture from destruction by disassociating it from the bourgeois order that has appropriated it. He is deeply concerned with resolving the conflict between culture and the masses, because his earnest wish is that the society that will emerge from the revolution which he judges to be inevitable shall be an enlightened one, a new renaissance. Faced with the reality of the Soviet experience, he knows there is a very real danger of a new Middle Ages, if there is no place for spiritual values, and the only aim is the satisfaction of material needs. Guéhenno's association of the Middle Ages with barbarism is unusual for the inter-war years, since at this time the Middle Ages were more frequently seen as a symbol of spirituality. The fact remains however, that despite having been an early supporter of the Soviet Revolution, Guéhenno now has doubts about the direction of this Revolution, and he expresses his misgivings in Caliban parle.

In Caliban parle, Guéhenno's second published work, but also the first where he presents his own views of major contemporary issues, he raises a certain number of problems which are so important to him, that they come to dominate most of his subsequent work. It is therefore necessary to consider the definition which he gives of Caliban, the problem of revolution and its relationship to culture, as well as the solutions which

he gives to the "divorce" between culture and the masses. Guéhenno's emphasis on spirituality requires an understanding of what are for him the consequences of atheism, whilst the attempt to reconcile individualism with the desire for collective action, raises the question of his view of society. Finally, Caliban parle poses the problem of Guéhenno's humanism, and his attempt to impose rationality as a limit on human behaviour.

It is the conscious desire of the author of Caliban parle that this work should be a critique of Renan's view of Caliban, made by Caliban himself. Renan defined the problem of Caliban for Guéhenno: "c'est en lisant Renan... que je me suis pour la première fois défini les termes du problème (C & P. p.60), and Caliban, the narrator of Caliban parle praises Renan for his interest in him: "tous les dieux vous intéressaient et nous portons un dieu en nous" (C.P. p.XIX). Nonetheless Caliban also states that: "J'ai été bien souvent tenté de corriger le portrait qu'il plut à Monsieur Renan de faire de moi (Caliban) (C.P. p.1). Frédéric Lefèvre is therefore correct, when he accuses Guéhenno in an interview for Les Nouvelles Littéraires: "d'avoir accepté d'entrer dans le jeu de Renan, d'avoir écrit un livre renanien"⁽⁸⁾. Caliban parle is not however, limited to a critique of Renan's definition of Caliban: Renan's dream of a society ruled by "quelques "tyrans positivistes"" (C.P. p.57) is condemned, military science being given as an example of the reality of such a dream: "les trajectoires étaient précisément celles qu'ils disaient, mais il leur importait assez peu que les "buts" à bombarder fussent le faux ou le vrai, la justice ou l'injustice" (C.P. p.58). Nevertheless, in other respects Renan's arguments are wholeheartedly supported by Guéhenno, who makes them

his own. This is particularly true of Renan's arguments on the consequences of atheism and the necessity of reason, presented in l'Avenir de la Science, which Guéhenno acknowledges as a major influence. He read it in his early years at the École Normale Supérieure "et je n'ai plus cessé de le relire" (C.V. p.192).

"C'est je pense bien (l'Avenir de la Science) qui m'a révélé à moi-même" (C. & P. p.42). In this work Renan claims his "religion", "c'est toujours le progrès de la raison, c'est à dire la science"⁽⁹⁾, because reason alone can "améliorer la malheureuse situation de l'homme ici bas"⁽¹⁰⁾. In his account of the Fall of Man, Renan argues that Man ejected himself from Paradise and the realm of myth, as he was destined to satisfy his curiosity. As a result Man is now alienated from God and from other men, but in the opinion of H.W. Wardman he is nonetheless proud of his knowledge, and is sustained by the faith that he shall find his own way to heaven⁽¹¹⁾. Wardman's view is shared by D.G. Charlton, who argues that

"Science has destroyed the idea of a supernatural paradise, but paradise may be brought down to earth and will finally be established "quand tous auront part à la lumière, à la perfection, à la beauté, et par là au bonheur""⁽¹²⁾

Renan advocates reason because it alone satisfies Man's greatest desire - curiosity, and gives Man the only tool with which to improve his lot⁽¹³⁾. Moreover reason aims to explain Man to himself⁽¹⁴⁾, and most importantly, Renan wants Man to progress⁽¹⁵⁾, not wander aimlessly outside the religious Paradise he has left. Renan's argument is reflected in Caliban parle, when Caliban declares: "je ne puis renoncer à la raison. Je me perdrai ou je me sauverai avec elle" (C.P. p.73).

Although Guéhenno's use of the name Caliban is a conscious reference to Renan, his definition of the contemporary Caliban is entirely his own. Caliban is the militant masses: "Mille pauvres ensemble ne sont plus des pauvres, mais "les rouges" et les boutiquiers ferment leurs boutiques" (C.P. p.91). Because of this the masses have to be restrained, and there is no better method, than to make them ashamed of themselves. Caliban is presented as a monster by society's masters because: "On espérait qu'en me trouvant... en face de mon affreuse image, j'aurais enfin honte de mes mauvais penchants" (C.P. p.91). Nevertheless, Caliban is indispensable to revolutionary leaders of every persuasion:

"Je suis l'artisan et la dupe des révolutions...
J'assure la victoire des autres, mais ne suis
moi-même jamais victorieux. La révolution
faite, je me retrouve toujours à la porte
du palais, comme un domestique chassé" (C.P. p.2).

This scenario repeated itself throughout the nineteenth century, but the change which has taken place in Caliban, means that this will not happen again. What has changed is that "Caliban pense" (C.P. p.XXV), and is therefore a fully conscious being, aware of his own value: "il faut qu'on joue avec moi comme avec quelqu'un d'intelligent et de vertueux" (C.P. p.24).

Given the highly individual nature of Guéhenno's definition of Caliban, it is to be expected that this definition is questioned. Robert Kemp asks: "le peuple a-t-il toutes les vertus, que M. Guéhenno admire?", and he rejects the view that Caliban has changed: "Caliban, c'est la foule impure... Regardez-le, le monstre en Russie"⁽¹⁶⁾. Albert Thibaudet points out that Caliban is Guéhenno, and criticises the latter for not speaking in his own name.

This is a criticism which he made earlier with regard to L'Évangile éternel, but at a more basic level he accepts Guéhenno's proposition that his Caliban speaks for the masses: "c'est un monologue... du peuple souffrant et militant"⁽¹⁷⁾. The view of Thibaudet is shared by most critics, who feel little compulsion to question the definition of Caliban, as it seems to them that Caliban is no more than a pseudonym for Guéhenno. Paul Souday states simply that Caliban is Guéhenno, and referring to the title he makes the ironic comment: "il parle bien, mais il parle un peu trop... Guéhenno est éloquent et pathétique"⁽¹⁸⁾. His view is supported by Romain Rolland, who also dislikes the use of the name Caliban⁽¹⁹⁾, and asks: "Pourquoi Caliban parle?... pourquoi pas... Je parle?" (C.Q.J.C. p.79)⁽²⁰⁾. In the interview with Lefèvre at the time of the publication of Caliban parle, Guéhenno accepts the critics' point concerning Caliban, but explains that: "je n'ai pas l'âge de confessions ni de mémoires", and stresses that: "si le drame que j'ai tenté d'évoquer n'était que mon drame... il serait... sans intérêt"⁽²¹⁾. The use of Caliban as narrator is therefore an attempt to underline the universal importance of Guéhenno's problem. It is not only the central themes of Caliban parle, which show it to be a very personal statement by Guéhenno. The very thinly disguised autobiographical details which he incorporates in the text, make this even more apparent. The references to "ma mère, pauvre vieille femme vaincue, Sycorax timide devant le destin que tu pensais charmer par tes pières" (C.P. p.15) whom Caliban finds "toute gémissante de (ses) fugues et de (ses) désertions" (C.P. p.33), clearly point to Guéhenno's own monther. This is evident when the text is

compared with the description of her given later in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans: "Dès cinq heures du matin (ma mère) était à sa machine et pédalait; jusqu'à onze heures du soir" (J.40. p.63). In this later text Guéhenno also refers to the fact that it is she who accused him of abandoning his roots: "Si tu nous aimais, tu accepterais de vivre comme nous avons tous vécu" (J.40. p.110). The personal nature of the issues dealt with in Caliban parle has the effect of making the book excessively subjective in tone, as well as in content. Guéhenno seems unable to distance himself from his feelings when he introduces autobiographical details, which is why Thibaudet claims that Caliban parle "est un (livre) sincère et passionné"⁽²²⁾. This is seen as a weakness by Robert Kemp, because as a result: "le calme et la lucidité sont, par malheur, ce qui manque le plus à M. Guéhenno"⁽²³⁾.

Notwithstanding the importance of the autobiographical elements in Caliban parle, the real significance of the book is to be found in its treatment of more general ideas, the principal one being that of revolution. Guéhenno's understanding of the term is uniquely personal, and it affects his view of culture, because given the definition of revolution, revolution and culture are largely synonymous. The origins of his view of revolution lie in religious faith and in the already noted influence of Buré. Recalling his early adolescence in Journal d'une "Révolution" in 1939, Guéhenno remembers Buré - a traveller who practised many trades, and who first spoke to him of revolution. Guéhenno describes him as an apostle and preacher in a biblical sense⁽²⁴⁾, adding: "mon premier Dieu était le Dieu chrétien...le sien (la révolution) était mon second" (J.R. p.27). Given this

introduction to revolution, Guéhenno sees it in quasi-religious terms: "Nos pières d'autrefois et nos révoltes d'aujourd'hui, c'est la même âme et la même foi" (C.P. p.7). Revolution comes to embody spiritual values formerly upheld by religion. In the days of religious faith: "de nous savoir associés à d'obscures fins idéales nous élevait à nos propres yeux" (C.P. p.9). An awareness of spiritual values remains in Caliban, but it has become disassociated from religion: "un autre temps est venu: nous ne donnons plus la même mesure de la fatalité... C'est une divine voix encore que celle qui chuchote: ... Il y a plus de grandeur à lutter qu'à souffrir" (C.P. p.10). Christianity teaches the importance of spiritual values and places great emphasis on the individual response to God, his commandments, as well as the role of the individual conscience. Although God is rejected, the religious ideal understood as a life of the spirit, remains valid for Guéhenno: "la vraie grandeur de l'homme est en sa vie intérieure" (C.P. p.106). Consequently revolution: "c'est l'idéalisme"(C.P. p.2), and its aims go beyond the satisfaction of material needs: "Les foules ouvrières... à l'instant où elles réclament le pain, pensent encore à organiser le monde" (C.P. p.19). Material needs are in fact of secondary importance: "Mieux vaudrait vous dire (Caliban) qu'il n'est pas sûr que vous deviez être heureux, et plutôt que la joie c'est espérer la grandeur" (C.P. pp.104-105). A revolution whose aim is "la grandeur de l'homme", that is spiritual improvement, is a never-ending process, which explains why Guéhenno rejects the idea of a revolutionary order: "Tu ne peux t'arrêter en chemin, esprit" (C.P. p.64). In the Lefèvre interview, Guéhenno makes

it very clear that revolution for him, is a spiritual ideal:

"La révolution c'est un esprit... prométhéen que je vois en action depuis le commencement du monde, mais plus particulièrement à certaines époques où l'homme prend conscience de sa destinée"⁽²⁵⁾.

From such a definition of revolution, it follows that revolution is an individual problem. Lefèvre draws attention to this when he states: "il ne faut pas jouer sur les mots, Guéhenno, si la révolution est un esprit, elle est un phénomène strictement individuel"⁽²⁶⁾.

Guéhenno does not dispute this:

"La seule chose à laquelle... (je) tiens (c'est) l'esprit... La révolution ne doit pas avoir d'autre objet que de permettre à tout homme de réaliser en lui-même certaine grandeur humaine... L'esprit de révolte me paraît être la condition même de la vie de la pensée"⁽²⁷⁾.

Guéhenno's thoughts on this matter are later echoed by Albert Camus in L'homme révolté, published in 1951: "La révolte... s'appuie sur le réel pour s'acheminer dans un combat perpétuel vers la vérité"⁽²⁸⁾.

By this time Guéhenno and Camus were well acquainted, so it is interesting to see this similarity in their views. Furthermore, Camus' withdrawal from Left-wing politics in the 1950 s closely parallels Guéhenno's much earlier disenchantment, which is expressed so forcefully in Journal d'une "Révolution".

The linking of revolution with individual thought and spiritual progress, not only shows that revolution is a problem for the individual⁽²⁹⁾, but also that it is synonymous with acquiring culture. Guéhenno's criticism of Soviet communism is particularly illuminating on this point: "Il m'en coûte que pour les vaincre nous ayons dû imiter nos maîtres... et devenir un moment aussi

mauvais qu'eux" (C.P. p.61). Guéhenno condemns bolshevik methods: "rien de plus bourgeois qu'un bolchevik, d'une certaine manière. La bourgeoisie la plus cauteleuse, la plus hypocrite... c'est celle-là même qu'il prend pour modèle" (C.P. p.61). He is equally opposed to bolshevik aims:

"Ils sont sûrs de la victoire, et j'entrevois l'ordre que seuls ils institueraient: un moyen âge. Ils pourront fonder une nouvelle Église, un ordre du cœur; ils seront heureux peut-être. Mais ne s'agit-il que de cela?" (C.P. p.63).

Guéhenno criticises the bolsheviks because their aims are exclusively materialistic: "Jamais on ne vit tentative plus positive... plus réaliste vers le bonheur" (C.P. p.61) These are not what he understands to be the goals of revolution, so in a letter to Jean Paulhan of about 1930, he expresses his regret at the dominance of bolshevik ideas: "je suis bien tenté à expliquer... que les communistes n'ont pas le privilège de la Révolution"⁽³⁰⁾. The condemnation of the bolsheviks as bourgeois materialists, invites a comparison between Guéhenno and Louis-Ferdinand Céline, whose Mea Culpa is of particular significance in this respect. Céline echoes Guéhenno's criticism of the bolsheviks in Caliban parle, when he states that:

"Le communisme matérialiste, c'est la Matière avant tout et quand il s'agit de matière c'est jamais le meilleur qui triomphe, c'est toujours le plus cynique, le plus rusé, le plus brutal. Regardez donc dans cette U.R.S.S.... comme l'argent a retrouvé tout de suite toute sa tyrannie!"⁽³¹⁾

It is important to realise that in Guéhenno's case, criticism of the U.S.S.R. is a necessary and logical consequence of his particular definition of revolution, but that he is a reluctant

critic: "Tantôt j'y vois le plus merveilleux effort... pour le salut des hommes. Tantôt je n'y vois qu'une tentation du désespoir" (C.P. p.59). Bearing in mind the time of writing however, this early criticism of the U.S.S.R. by a Left-wing intellectual is significant, and it shows that Guéhenno thought out his position on the Soviet question at a very early stage of his public literary career. It is also a matter of significance, that Guéhenno's criticism of the bolsheviks amounts to an attack on their lack of, and indifference to, culture. He sees them, and communists in general, as uncivilised barbarians, but the blame for this state of affairs is placed squarely on the cultural elite, who have abandoned the masses to their own devices: "Si vous étiez avec nous, Prospero, notre victoire, je le sais, serait plus belle: une Renaissance; et nous serions moins heureux, il se peut, mais plus nobles" (C.P. p.63).

Since Guéhenno's aim is the spiritual improvement of the individual, and this is therefore the purpose of revolution as defined by him, the question of culture becomes the major issue, and it is the central theme of Caliban parle. Culture is Guéhenno's chief preoccupation in the inter-war period⁽³²⁾, and he himself later admits to this in Caliban et Prospero of 1969: "Je m'accuse d'avoir cru un peu trop... à la science et à la culture" (C.& P.p.18). Consequently he is extremely concerned by what he sees as a divorce between culture and the masses, and he seeks to demonstrate why this is so. The attitude to culture in the U.S.S.R. shows this to be an issue requiring urgent attention. Guéhenno's argument seeks to expose "false" culture. He condemns the masters of

society who seek spiritual, as well as material domination:

"Les voilà grands propriétaires, grands industriels... et nos maîtres. Et de se donner pour des Prospero" (C.P. p.5). More importantly he realises that the cultural elite is prepared to compromise its principles for material gain: "Mis à part quelques vieux savants qu'on admire et n'imite point, tout se vend, tout veut être payé" (C.P. p.20). This temptation may even involve outright betrayal of the values the cultural elite claims to uphold: "la vraie trahison est de suivre le monde comme il va et d'employer l'esprit à le justifier" (C.P. p.54). As well as a tendency to profit from its position in the world, the cultural elite demonstrates an equally dangerous tendency towards an elitism which turns its back on the world. Caliban dislikes "ce principe de dédain, d'exclusion et d'orgueil qu'ils prétendent nécessaire à toute culture et que dans la réalité ils sont les seuls à y mettre" (C.P. pp. 36-37). The view of culture as "un spectacle réservé" (C.P. p.88) is to be regretted, because it alienates the masses and therefore deprives them of culture: "Personne n'a pour (les livres) plus d'amour que ceux d'entre nous (Calibans) pour qui l'interdit fut levé" (C.P. p.30). This is why aristocratic humanism is to be condemned. Drawing heavily on the views of Michelet which he expounded in L'Évangile éternel, Caliban-Guéhenno states: "ils (les maîtres) n'ont pas manqué d'appeler humanisme ce savoir orgueilleux et méprisant, et ce beau mot fausse tout le débat... mais à dire le vrai, toutes leurs sophistications ne nous enseignent ... qu'à nous haïr" (C.P. p.37).

Although he deplores the selfish elitism surrounding culture, Guéhenno is aware that certain aspects of intellectual culture cannot be appreciated by the masses. Science in particular, requires a high degree of specialisation, and must therefore be closed to the layman, at least in part: "Parmi ces intellectuels ... beaucoup n'ont pas renoncé à la sagesse... Ils cherchent dans la solitude de leurs cabinets et de leurs laboratoires" (C.P. p.105). Guéhenno does not dispute that specialisation is needed, but he notes that the autonomy afforded to the cultural elite, too often leads to indifference to society: "O charme du dilettantisme, et de penser pour penser, pour rien, pour plaisir" (C.P. p.39). Moreover, narrow specialisation tends to destroy a broader awareness of cultural values among the elite itself: "La puissance de Prospero dispersée désormais en des milliers d'intelligences n'est nulle part capable de retrouver, avec son unité, le sentiment d'elle-même et de ses devoirs" (C.P. p.55).

For Guéhenno the most important result of the increasing separation between culture and the masses - due largely to the behaviour of the cultural elite, is that Caliban is tempted to reject culture altogether, and to despair of the value of reason: "À vivre trop continûment dans l'obscurité la tentation vient de haïr la lumière" (C.P. p.29). This is a very important admission, because it weakens Guéhenno's argument that Caliban is in principle responsive to culture if he is allowed access to it. Ramon Fernandez, who knew Guéhenno from Paul Desjardin's "Décades" at the Abbaye de Pontigny, and whose politics in the 1920s were definitely to the Left⁽³³⁾, sees the conflict between culture and

the masses as the chief interest of Caliban parle. Nevertheless he rejects Guéhenno's view that this conflict is "une invention des riches"⁽³⁴⁾. Fernandez believes that "on ne peut pas lier ensemble les intérêts de Caliban et ceux de Prospero", because "pour les êtres de son (Prospero) espèce, les conditions sociales auront toujours infiniment moins d'importance que l'exercice pur et parfait de l'esprit"⁽³⁵⁾. The death-bed remorse shown by Prospero seems unrealistic to Fernandez⁽³⁶⁾, who regards the conflict between culture and the masses to be irresolvable. Furthermore, he reduces the significance of the conflict, to a question of Guéhenno's personal conscience: For him, Guéhenno is torn between "un jugement pragmatique fondé sur une sorte de patriotisme de la sensibilité populaire, et un appel aux lois pures et libres de l'esprit"⁽³⁷⁾. He appreciates that Guéhenno seeks to be faithful to his roots as well as to "l'esprit", "(mais) il (Guéhenno) doit arriver à comprendre... que la dernière conquête de l'esprit consiste justement à savoir se désintéresser... non par infidélité, mais par... réflexion"⁽³⁸⁾. Guéhenno wishes culture to disassociate itself from society's masters, but a free spirit "ne se soucierait plus des pauvres que des riches"⁽³⁹⁾. The biographical approach which Fernandez takes in relation to Caliban parle suggests that the "guilt complex" associated with "déclassement", which plagued Guéhenno since his years at the Lycée de Rennes, is still a problem for him. Fernandez' approach is understandable, given that he knew Guéhenno socially from the "Décades", but Guéhenno's experiences at the Collège de Fougères are also of relevance here. When Fernandez

describes Caliban parle as the drama of "un Caliban cultivé"⁽⁴⁰⁾, it is impossible to forget how at the Collège Guéhenno felt himself to be a Caliban who was hungry for knowledge, but one who was looked down upon by his richer peers. Thibaudet shares Fernandez' view of the conflict between culture and the masses presented in Caliban parle. For Thibaudet Guéhenno's real problem is: "l'intelligence es les métiers de l'intelligence, ne me détacheront-ils de ma classe?"⁽⁴¹⁾. This is a theme which Guéhenno develops more fully in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, but already in Caliban parle he himself admits that "la beauté séduit, le bonheur déclasse" (C.P. p.35). Because of this, Thibaudet believes that Guéhenno tries to resolve the conflict between culture and the masses, by posing the question: "Y a-t-il une pensée de classe, une littérature de classe?"⁽⁴²⁾. It is obvious that if class culture exists, there is no longer any conflict between culture and the people. Guéhenno's own style however, suggests class literature does not exist. Thibaudet notes that Guéhenno "écrit sur un plan bourgeois"⁽⁴³⁾, as does Lefèvre: "Caliban parle... ne me semblait pas devoir être lu facilement par le peuple"⁽⁴⁴⁾. Guéhenno's reply to this avoids the issue of popular culture: "Il m'apparut que Caliban devait parler pour ses maîtres plus que pour ses frères"⁽⁴⁵⁾, but Guéhenno does have clear views on "popular" culture. In his unpublished radio lecture "L'art et le peuple au XIX^e siècle" of the 5th May 1931, he is scathing about "ce qu'on appelle quelquefois la "littérature populaire", ces livres de série, ces livres industriels et imbéciles"⁽⁴⁶⁾, and asks: "Quel grand nom populaire trouverait-on à citer parmi nos classiques?"⁽⁴⁷⁾.

The main reason for this is the inability of the masses to create a literature of their own: "(le prolétariat) n'a pu inventer un grand art"⁽⁴⁸⁾. In Guéhenno's view this problem cannot be overcome, because "le grand art ne va pas sans technique et que cette technique elle-même comporte un apprentissage"⁽⁴⁹⁾. This belief places Guéhenno in direct conflict with official communist teaching, and he himself later notes this in his introduction to the Kharkov resolution "Sur les questions de la littérature prolétarienne et révolutionnaire en France"⁽⁵⁰⁾, which he published in Europe in December 1931.

The main characteristic of Caliban parle is that the issues it raises are of such general significance, that it is impossible to discuss them by reference to this text alone. The notion of culture as a non-political concept is one such issue. Guéhenno's view on this matter is challenged by the communists, for whom culture and politics are indivisible⁽⁵¹⁾. A detailed exposition of the communist position is to be found in Paul Nizan's Les chiens de garde, which because it is a work contemporary with Caliban parle, invites comparison with the latter. Nizan denies the existence of a single eternal "philosophie"⁽⁵²⁾, because philosophy means talking about man's position and this keeps changing⁽⁵³⁾. Since philosophy is a reaction to conditions and not an abstract system⁽⁵⁴⁾, and because no absolutes are possible, philosophy is only a practical knowledge which can serve any purpose⁽⁵⁵⁾. Nizan considered philosophical idealism to be bourgeois and sees reason, understood as a movement of the spirit as well as a private, individual phenomenon, as a

bourgeois attitude to thought⁽⁵⁶⁾. He believes the concern with spiritual values to be peculiar to the bourgeoisie, whose notion of property (shares) is also abstract⁽⁵⁷⁾, and he further rejects the bourgeois view of salvation as an individual problem⁽⁵⁸⁾. From this account it becomes clear that Guéhenno, who believes in reason⁽⁵⁹⁾, and who defines revolution as spiritual improvement, is defending the "bourgeois" position. Indeed Nizan makes a direct reference to him in Les chiens de garde: "Guéhenno... veut rester fidèle à des dieux antiques... et ne point trahir... espoirs... (de) cette grande masse exploitée"⁽⁶⁰⁾.

Nizan is not alone in rejecting Guéhenno's view of culture as a non-partisan absolute. Emmanuel Berl writing for Les Nouvelles Littéraires also states frankly: "Je ne connais pas la culture... Guéhenno veut qu'un certain mouvement de l'esprit... entre Socrate de Diderot, entre Lucrèce et Nietzsche - ait une valeur absolu"⁽⁶¹⁾. Berl's views on culture are more fully expressed in Mort de la morale bourgeois, which Guéhenno published in Europe in November 1929. Here like Nizan, Berl emphasises the class bias of culture: "comme la culture rapproche le bourgeois de l'aristocrate, elle l'oppose au prolétaire"⁽⁶²⁾. Furthermore he also rejects Guéhenno's view of culture as individual spiritual self-improvement:

"La culture (c'est) une certaine relation que la collectivité impose à ses membres... Et il ne s'agit pas tant de pousser l'individu au plus haut de ses facultés que de l'intégrer à un certain groupe"⁽⁶³⁾.

The concept of "intellectual treason" outlined by Guéhenno in Caliban parle⁽⁶⁴⁾, involves him in a debate begun by Julien Benda

in La trahison des clercs, which appeared a year earlier in 1927. The concept itself is certainly as much Guéhenno's as it is Benda's, and in Caliban parle he states: "On n'eût jamais pensé que Prométhée, l'éternel révolté, fût à si bon marché la paix avec Jupiter... On ne distingue plus entre les valeurs de civilisation et les grandeurs d' établissement" (C.P. p.54). In La trahison des clercs Benda begins his argument by stating that the work of a "clerc" has metaphysical aims⁽⁶⁵⁾, so he should remain aloof from mundane arguments⁽⁶⁶⁾. Benda regrets that modern "clercs" have abandoned idealist transcendental values⁽⁶⁷⁾, and strongly condemns those who, like the monarchist historian, serve prejudices: "(il) présente le passé du point de vue des passions de son temps"⁽⁶⁸⁾. Benda sees the collapse of classical culture⁽⁶⁹⁾ as the root cause of the decadence of the "clercs", and calls for "clérical" purity, although he appreciates that in today's world it is nearly impossible to be a "clerc"⁽⁷⁰⁾. Benda's opinion that, since 1890, intellectuals have known that fame comes from pandering to prejudice⁽⁷¹⁾, and have acted accordingly, is shared by Guéhenno, but Benda's belief that "les valeurs cléricales sont statiques - la justice abstraite, la vérité abstraite, la raison absolue"⁽⁷²⁾. is unacceptable to him, since it implies withdrawing into an ivory tower, which he sees as a major reason for Caliban's increasing hostility to culture. In Consciousness and Society H. Stuart Hughes criticises Benda for not realising that because he lives in society an intellectual must make compromises⁽⁷³⁾. Guéhenno, in a public letter to Benda published in Europe in February 1930, also criticises him for an indifference to the world's problems,

which is inherent in Benda's position:

"La trahison des clercs... (me)... procura un immense plaisir... (mais) aux vrais combats de la terre vous ne vous intéressez pas... Dans le seul usage que vous faites du mot clerc, il me semble discerner un dangereux mépris pour les... laïcs que nous sommes... Le progrès du monde... (c'est que) tout laïc se croit et veut être clerc (mais) nous n'avons ici nulle prétention à être clercs. Être des hommes nous suffirait"⁽⁷⁴⁾.

Once again, Guéhenno's view of the 1930s is to be found later in Albert Camus' work, notably in La Peste of 1947. At the end of the novel Dr. Rieux the narrator, realises that his account can only be:

"le témoignage de ce qu'il avait fallu accomplir et que... devraient accomplir encore... tous les hommes qui, ne pouvant être des saints et refusant d'admettre les fléaux, s'efforcent cependant d'être des médecins"⁽⁷⁵⁾.

Moreover "il pensait qu'il était juste que... la joie vînt récompenser ceux qui se suffisaient de l'homme et de son pauvre et terrible amour"⁽⁷⁶⁾. In the reply which Benda gives to Guéhenno's criticism, he accuses him of wanting the best of both worlds by claiming that "le laïc peut devenir clerc en restant laïc"⁽⁷⁷⁾. Benda also condemns as mere "sophisme", Guéhenno's attempts to resolve the contradictions in his position, by treating virtues such as justice and respect for peace as "des valeurs pratiques" ⁽⁷⁸⁾. "L'essence du clerc", adds Benda: "c'est de n'avoir pas d'intérêts pratiques à défendre"⁽⁷⁹⁾. Because he consciously adopts an elitist attitude towards culture, Benda has none of Guéhenno's worries about culture being unavailable to the masses. It is important

to note, however, that this inaccessibility is a direct result of Benda's definition of culture as rational ideas and an irrational sensibility. Culture today:

"désigne... beaucoup plus la sensibilité aux valeurs d'art... qu'aux valeurs intellectuels et morales... Les maîtres, en tant qu'ils nous proposent des idées... constituent l'élément rationnel de la culture, lequel, pour cette raison est assimilable à tous, mais... dans la mesure où ils manifestent la haute réussite artistique ils en sont l'élément irrationnel"(80).

Culture is not therefore accessible to the masses. Guéhenno is given a choice of proving that "cette sensibilité ^Asuprême, les (masses) en sont capables autant que les bourgeois", or admitting that: "ce sentiment de l'exquis - (les masses) ne l'ont pas, ne l'auront jamais... (donc) ils travailleront à le détruire"(81). Guéhenno does not answer Benda on this point, but his solution to the problem of culture, as well as his definition of culture, show that he understands culture as a purely rational tendency.

Since there is clearly no agreement on the definition of culture, Guehenno's solution to the conflict between culture and the masses, must also be open to question. He believes that there is a solution to the problem of culture and the masses, if a distinction is made between knowledge and culture: "Il ne faut pas confondre culture et savoir" (C.P. p.81). Culture is defined as:

"une certaine disposition à la connaissance.
Elle est l'inquiétude du vrai et du juste,
certaine exaltation permanente de l'esprit
... Ainsi arrive-t-il que des savants très
savants ne font jamais que des butors et qu'on
peut parler de la culture naturelle de gens du
peuple qui ne fréquentèrent pas l'école" (C.P. p.81).

In contrast, knowledge is a mere tool, which can serve any purpose.
Guéhenno mentions the military scientists: "Leur"vérité" a bien
été la force; leurs calculs, à l'épreuve, se sont montrés exacts
et personne de nous ne songerait à mettre en doute l'irrécusabilité
des 75" (C.P. pp. 57-58). To him it is obvious that: "de très
grands savants ne sont pas nécessairement de très grands
esprits" (C.P. p.55).

The solution outlined by Guéhenno presupposes that intelligence
is equally distributed in men, so that common people who lack
knowledge, are nonetheless capable of understanding cultural
ideas, if they are made available to them. Guéhenno asserts that
"c'est le même esprit... qu'un ouvrier emploie à bien utiliser
sa machine et M. Renan à déchiffrer les saints livres" (C.P. p.45).
This statement is however challenged by Paul Souday, who notes
that Guéhenno is worried by the unequal participation of men
in intellectual culture, and states:

"Ou a fait ce qu'on a pu: la culture est
maintenant accessible à tous les fils du
peuple s'ils ont les aptitudes voulues.
(Mais) les intelligences sont très inégales.
Ce n'est pas la faute de la société"(82).

Because there is disagreement over what is meant by "culture",
Guéhenno's critique provoked very different reactions. He himself
only rejects the "perversion" of a cultural ideal which is his

own, and which has led to Caliban becoming indifferent to culture: "Entre les fous de l'esprit et ses manoeuvres, entre des mandarins qui nous ignorent et des techniciens qui ne voient en nous que des utilités, que veut-on que nous devenions?" (C.P. p.57). Guéhenno likewise condemns the transformation of humanism into "ce savoir orueilleux et méprisant" (C.P. p.37), and the desire to make culture the privilege of an elite: "Le spectacle de la beauté est un spectacle réservé" (C.P. p.88). His own analysis of the aims of Caliban parle given in Sur le chemin des hommes in 1959 is that "(Caliban) dénonçait le divorce qu'il y avait entre l'humanité et les "humanités"... et condamnait un système... qui... faisait de la culture justement un privilège et un moyen de domination" (S.L.C.H. p.18). What Guéhenno does want, is "true" culture: "J'ai retrouvé les vrai sens de la culture... Je sais ce que j'y dois chercher. Un esprit s'y cache qui délivre et qui sauve" (C.P. p.43). Such a culture is also desired by Caliban, who is not opposed to culture as such, but is nonetheless denied access to it: "comment aimer ce qui vous est interdit?" (C.P. p.30). Robert Kemp however, does not accept that Guéhenno only attacks the perversion of culture: "Dans la frénésie égalitaire M. Guéhenno souhaite le retour à la barbarie"⁽⁸³⁾. He also accuses Guéhenno of anti-intellectualism: "qu'il le hait, M. Guéhenno, l'intellectuel!"⁽⁸⁴⁾. Recalling the reaction to Caliban parle Guéhenno admits that "une grande partie de la presse... affecta de ne voir dans mon livre qu'une grossière condamnation de la culture" (C. & P. p.30).

This does not mean that Guéhenno has somehow failed to put across the main argument in his book - it is simply the result of the fact that his view of culture, and hence of what is to be defended, is not shared by all⁽⁸⁵⁾.

Guéhenno has two main conclusions in Caliban parle: He rejects the "perversion" of culture, and secondly he calls for a culture that is relevant to all. This last point is made in the account of Prospero's death. On his death-bed, Prospero repents:

"Caliban... je t'ai fait venir pour te
demander pardon... j'ai manqué pour toi de
douceur et de bonté... Il est grand temps
de me connaître moi-même et de m'avouer ma
dureté. Telle était ma science: indifférente"
(C.P. p.95).

This call for culture to be relevant to the masses is echoed in Guéhenno's other works of the period, particularly in the radio broadcast "L'Art et le peuple au XIX^e siècle", of May 1931: "J'ai à vous parler d'une de plus merveilleuses aventures de l'esprit, de l'effort que depuis plus d'un siècle les plus grands artistes ont fait pour rencontrer le peuple et créer un grand art populaire"⁽⁸⁶⁾. Such appeals are extremely important, because they prefigure Guéhenno's later support for the idea of intellectual "engagement" during the early part of the Front Populaire period, and his numerous articles for Vendredi. It is also worth noting in this respect, the early influence on Guéhenno of Martin du Gard, the precursor of "engagé" literature⁽⁸⁷⁾. It will be remembered that Guéhenno read Jean Barois in 1915, and found in it a justification for the beliefs which the war had undermined "La guerre... m'obligeait à me demander ce que valaient mes songes de liberté et de paix. Jean Barois remit

tout en ordre" (D.L.D.P. p.91) ⁽⁸⁸⁾.

The question of atheism and its consequences raised in Caliban parle, is a theme of universal importance and it involves Guéhenno in the arguments of Nietzsche, as atheism is for both the starting point of all philosophical speculation: Guéhenno-Caliban says: "Nous croyions... jadis que (Dieu) existait... Désormais nous savons bien qu'il n'est pas" (C.P. p.7). The very close parallels between Guéhenno's and Nietzsche's atheism, as well as Guéhenno's familiarity with Nietzsche's ideas ⁽⁸⁹⁾, make a comparison between the two especially important. Nietzsche does not prove the non-existence of God. In his famous parable of the Madman in The Joyful Wisdom ⁽⁹⁰⁾, he affirms that God is dead, but does not deny his existence in any absolute sense ⁽⁹¹⁾: Indeed he admits that atheism "is a matter of instinct with me" ⁽⁹²⁾. Nevertheless Nietzsche is personally convinced that God is dead, and that this is possible because "les hommes ont créé Dieu" ⁽⁹³⁾. Guéhenno shares this attitude, as he does not deny either the appeal or the truth of religion: "J'accorde que tel ou tel trouve encore dans la foi chrétienne l'occasion d'admirables effusions d'amour" (C.P. p.75). He is however convinced, that "nous créons (les Dieux) du meilleur de nous-mêmes" (C.P. p.67) ⁽⁹⁴⁾, and can therefore "kill" them. Guéhenno is content as an atheist ⁽⁹⁵⁾, because since God is dead, Man is free, which is something that he believes all Men welcome: "L'instinct de liberté...m'entraîne" (C.P. p.10). Moreover:

"Quoique tu (Caliban) n'ignores pas que nous n'instituerons pas le Paradis sur la terre, tu ne cesses pas d'y songer cependant...Mieux vaudrait vous dire qu'il n'est pas sûr que vous deviez être heureux et plutôt que la joie c'est espérer la grandeur" (C.P. pp. 104-105).

This statement shows that Guéhenno shares the pre-1914 socialist view of Nietzsche, as he takes his friend Halévy's view that Nietzsche's central preoccupation is ennobling Man⁽⁹⁶⁾; that is the individual⁽⁹⁷⁾. Of equal importance is the influence of Nietzsche on the style of Caliban parle, which Guéhenno acknowledges in Carnets du vieil écrivain of 1971. Whilst writing Guéhenno always kept a bookmark on which he noted "quelques recommandations d'amis ou d'écrivains" (C.D.V.E. p.133). Among others he notes:

"cette page de Nietzsche que j'ai trouvée en 1925 et qui définit "le livre parfait", à considérer: "La forme, le style. Un monologue idéal... Tous les accents de la passion profonde... Aller au-delà des démonstrations, être absolument personnel sans employer la première personne... En quelque sorte un dialogue d'esprits, une provocation, un appel""⁽⁹⁸⁾.

The ideas of an "ideal monologue", of provocation and the need to write with passion, all characterise the style of Caliban parle, whilst the Nietzschean idea of God as a human invention is critical to Guéhenno's whole argument in this book. Furthermore it is obvious that Guéhenno's understanding of Nietzsche is essentially that of a pre-1914 socialist, which means that his perspective on Nietzsche, developed in his early days at the École Normale Supérieure, has changed little.

The consequences of atheism are various, as the "death of God" leads to a search for what Pierre de Boisdeffre terms "une morale de remplacement"⁽⁹⁹⁾. In this situation a return to religion can be tempting: "Il est commode d'opposer à l'absence d'ordre dont nous souffrons aujourd'hui un ordre chrétien idéal" (C.P. p.73). This is a temptation that initially appealed to

Michelet, and which is explored in L'Évangile éternel, but it is rejected by Guéhenno, because for him Man replaces God when he realises that God is his creation: "Nous... créons (les dieux) du meilleur de nous-mêmes" (C.P. p.67). It is important to realise that atheism for Guéhenno, does not involve the destruction of spiritual values. The legacy of religion is to remind all men "de se devoir surtout que nous avons de sauver l'esprit" (C.P. p.14). Hence Caliban is not ashamed of his religious past, precisely because it introduced him to spiritual concepts: "Jésus, Dieu résigné... qui nous fîtes aimer la souffrance, je ne rougis pas d'avoir été de votre "saint plèbe". Vous avez commencé de nous initier à nous-mêmes, appris la grandeur de notre servitude" (C.P. p.9). Guéhenno's aim is to save the spiritual from the debris of religion, and he does this by making revolution a spiritual ideal, which appeals to the same spiritual needs as religion: "Nos prières d'autrefois et nos révoltes d'aujourd'hui c'est la même âme et la même foi" (C.P. p.7) ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾.

Although in Caliban parle, Guéhenno attacks intellectuals for their lack of social concern, he is also an individualist, despite his unwillingness to admit to this. Mme. Annie Guéhenno recalls that "il était très individualiste, mais il s'en défendait" ⁽¹⁰¹⁾. An individualist outlook is implicit in Guéhenno's understanding of revolution as spiritual improvement. What is important about Guéhenno, is that he seeks to reconcile individualism with social action, and thereby transcend the individual versus society conflict, which is such a major theme in nineteenth century

literature. In Caliban parle he presents the outlines of the argument which he continued to restate throughout his life, notably in such works as Conversion à l'humain, Journal d'une "Révolution", Sur le chemin des hommes, and Ce que je crois.

Finding himself in the trenches during the First World War was the decisive experience in the formulation of his social views: "La chaleur humaine de nouveau me brûlait le visage. Quelque chose... m'associait à cette masse... Je ne pouvais plus me mentir. Sa destinée était la mienne et son salut le mien"(C.P. p.42). The idea of war as the forger of human solidarity is later expanded by Guéhenno in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, and it is also a theme which figures prominently in the contemporary work of Jean-Paul Sartre, beginning with the novel La Nausée. The Autodidacte in La Nausée gives an account of his experience in a crowded prison shed of a P.O.W. Camp, which closely parallels Guéhenno's own view:

"Tous les hommes étaient là... on les sentait contre soi... la presse était si forte que je crus d'abord étouffer, puis, subitement, une joie puissante s'éleva en moi... alors je sentis que j'aimais ces hommes comme des frères"(102).

The realisation of the equivalence between individual destinies is the essence of Guéhenno's conception of other people, and of class solidarity. Class solidarity is for him no more than a realisation, that since nearly all individuals are alike, each by acting in his own interest, can also act in the interests of all. Therefore: "Nous (Calibans) ne pouvons cesser d'être fidèles; cela nous rapporterait trop" (C.P. 1.14). Caliban's cause is only more just than that of any other social group, because the masses form a majority in society: "En demeurant

fidèles à nous-mêmes, peu s'en faut que nous soyons fidèles à tous les hommes" (C.P. pp. 114-115).

Guéhenno's argument that when an individual acts out of self-interest, his action also has social significance, because it serves the interests of all those who are like him, means Guéhenno avoids the individual versus society conflict, and moreover preserves the autonomy of the individual. He is very concerned at the threat to the individual and individuality, posed by the modern world: "le monde moderne... détruit l'individuel" (C.P. p.90). Guéhenno condemns "le bas amour de l'ordre à tout prix" (C.P. p.21), and wants to be accepted as he is, a Caliban: "Je veux qu'on m'aime dans ma révolte et pour ma révolte. Je veux qu'on aime le meilleur de moi-même, cette semence d'audace... cette volonté insoumise qui m'associe à l'oeuvre de l'homme éternel" (C.P. p.22). The argument that one individual's interests are the same as those of another, means Guéhenno must praise similarity: "Il me semble qu'à se découvrir semblable on connaît... une profonde joie" (C.P. p.111). At the same time he condemns the selfish, elitist individuality, represented by Prospero: "J'ai appris jadis de Prospero que les hommes doivent mettre tout leur honneur à se distinguer et s'estimer d'être différents. Je me méfie de ces conseils" (C.P. p.111). Such a condemnation is understandable, because if individuals have similar interests, then by separating himself from others the individual is turning his back on his potential allies, and is therefore acting contrary to his own interests, as well as failing to further the interests of all those in a position similar to his own.

Guéhenno's contractual view of society results in constraints being placed on political leaders. In a sense, his view of social phenomena as by-products of individual self-interest challenges the very necessity of leadership:

"Caliban ne pense pas à devenir un maître.
Il lui suffit d'être un homme de meilleur
service, mieux lié à tous les autres, à
cause justement de ces clartés qu'il a sur
leur commune et tragique destinée" (C.P. p.44).

Nonetheless an important service can be rendered by someone whose personal interests are shared by all:

"Je me rappelle un cordonnier bossu qui mena
une fois à la bataille toute une ville.
Les froissements qu'avait valus à son
armour propre la malformation de son corps
l'avaient éveillé à la conscience du
froissement plus profond que subit encore
dans les hommes l'humanité. On eût dit
qu'il portait sur son dos toute la
misère" (C.P. p.23).

Guéhenno's explanation of social phenomena in terms of individual self-interest, prefigures Sartre's account of social behaviour, especially the concept of seriality, expressed in Critique de la raison dialectique⁽¹⁰³⁾. Like Guéhenno, Sartre places the individual at the centre of his system of thought, and the individual is his chief concern. This is because consciousness is located in the individual, it is self-sufficient - so history must come to it from without⁽¹⁰⁴⁾, and more importantly consciousness do not fuse, hence each individual is essentially condemned to solitude⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. The primacy and self-sufficiency of the individual means that in the opinion of Raymond Aron, Sartre "bases the necessity of aggregate history upon the freedom of individual agents"⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. This in turn results in Sartre's view

of social bodies as series⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. The example he gives, is a bus queue, which only appears to be a social body from the outside, as each individual in the queue is there for different reasons⁽¹⁰⁸⁾, and may not even be aware of the presence of others.

A series may however, transform itself into an active social body - a group, although "la nécessité du groupe, ... n'est pas donnée à priori dans un rassemblement quelconque"⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. An example of a group-in-fusion is the crowd that stormed the Bastille: the inhabitants of the area feared being caught in a cross-fire and becoming victims of a repetition of the Tuilleries massacre. Each individual inhabitant was therefore obliged to negate this possibility for himself, that is subjectively⁽¹¹⁰⁾. Because the threat to each was the same, each individual was incapable of distinguishing his own safety from that of the other inhabitants⁽¹¹¹⁾. The praxis, defined by A. Sheridan-Smith as "the activity of an individual or group in organising conditions in the light of some end"⁽¹¹²⁾ of all inhabitants, were therefore reciprocal, which allowed them all to take part in a collective act as a group, without in any way limiting their freedom as individuals⁽¹¹³⁾. In Sartre's opinion a group needs no leaders⁽¹¹⁴⁾, or orders⁽¹¹⁵⁾, as each individual in the group acts out of self-interest. Identical conditions produce identical reactions in all individuals within a group, so the group is fraternal, as each individual sees himself in the other⁽¹¹⁶⁾. Although the behaviour of the group is the sum of individual acts of self-interest, it is nonetheless capable of a momentous action, such as the storming of the Bastille. The concept of the group allows Sartre to accept in practical terms,

the existence of social concepts and bodies within the framework of ontological individualism⁽¹¹⁷⁾. In other words he reconciles social collective action with individualist principles, which incidentally is also Guéhenno's goal. Guéhenno's experience in the trenches is exactly that of those individuals, who in Sartre's account stormed the Bastille.

Obviously a pre-requisite for the claim that collective social action and individual self-interested action can be equivalent is that all individuals share the same conditions, face the same problems (both material and psychological), and are basically alike. Therefore, in order to substantiate that part of his argument which is later taken up by Sartre, Guehenno sets about proving the existence of a "common core" in Man. In so doing, he also proves that the conditions for revolution - understood as a social as well as spiritual phenomenon, now exist.

The main argument concerning the "common core" is to be found in Caliban parle. Of relevance here, are Guéhenno's views that men no longer believe in God, that spiritual values remain and are now associated with revolution, and that self-interest motivates all: "Nous voulons manger à notre faim, boire à notre soif, dormir dans des draps blancs" (C.P. p.16). All men moreover, possess an intellect which affords access to a higher, spiritual life:

"Si l'esprit ne se donne à toi (Caliban), tu l'accuses de trahison. L'esprit n'est à personne. Il se prête à tous... Maîtres, serviteurs, prolétaires, bourgeois, ces mots-là ne lui disent rien. Il ignore ces distinctions. Il n'est d'aucune classe" (C.P. p.106).

All these factors, taken together, show that there is sufficient similarity among individuals, to enable them to co-operate in the achievement of common goals.

The adoption of a individualist standpoint, has obvious repercussions for humanism, which must henceforth be centred on the individual and limit itself to defending individual rights. Micheline Tison-Braun believes that this is particularly true of the post-1918 humanism⁽¹¹⁸⁾ represented by Guéhenno, although any definition of humanism involves a recognition of freedom regarding oneself and the world⁽¹¹⁹⁾, which makes humanism individualistic in principle⁽¹²⁰⁾. Nevertheless, as Joseph Hoffman points out, in the post-1918 world "on commence à s'interroger sur l'homme lui-même et sur l'image que l'Occident s'en était faite"⁽¹²¹⁾. This is a major problem for André Malraux, a life-long friend of Guéhenno⁽¹²²⁾, who questions the validity of basing humanism on the individual. Malraux sees that the Western notion of Man is based on the individual: "toute une tradition a cherché à construire un humanisme autour de l'individu"⁽¹²³⁾. In La tentation de l'Occident he adds that the individual "veut se soumettre le monde"⁽¹²⁴⁾. With the discovery of the unconscious however, it is no longer possible to base a humanism on the individual: "il nous est impossible de fonder notre moi sur ce que nous faisons"⁽¹²⁵⁾. In La tentation de l'Occident Malraux realises that "en acceptant la notion de l'inconscient... l'Europe s'est privée de ses meilleurs armes"⁽¹²⁶⁾. Since humanism was born with the "discovery" of the individual⁽¹²⁷⁾, humanism itself is threatened. Malraux's solution is to base humanism on action, because "l'action est la

seule réalité qui puisse donner un sens à l'existence"(128) .
His cult of heroism, referred to by Pierre de Boisdeffre (129)
shows nonetheless, that the individual is still a major concern
of his. As Joseph Hoffman comments: "(ses) personnages... sont
profondément individualistes"(130) . The interest in the individual
is also shown by Malraux's concern for human dignity, which is a
legacy of Christianity: "une religion qui ne cesse de vous faire
croire à votre existence particulière"(131) . Hoffman sees this
view of Christianity, as a religion which encourages individualism
and therefore gives rise to a sense of dignity in Man, demonstrated
in the Chinese characters of La Condition Humaine. Only those
characters who are familiar with Christianity are, he claims, aware
of their dignity, and become revolutionaries (132) . Malraux's
argument concerning the importance of the unconscious is directly
relevant to Guéhenno and his views on rationality. This is because
Guéhenno sees humanism as based on the individual and on rationality:

"C'est le christianisme qui m'a (Caliban)
dégû. Je parviens enfin à l'humanisme.
Notre coeur obscur n'est plus seulement
obscur. Il ne saurait se contenter de
cette placidité à tout prix que vous
(Chrétiens) lui offrez" (C.P. p.72).

Rationality is the last issue of general importance, to be
raised in Caliban parle. It is clear that a revolution or society,
based on interests shared by all individuals - the "core" argument,
need not necessarily be an enlightened one, as Guéhenno himself
acknowledges: "s'il faut parler du... sens commun (des hommes),
pouvons-nous ne pas reconnaître aussi leur sottise commune"(C.P. p.80) .
The first goal of Guéhenno's revolution is consciousness, but the

question inevitably arises; to what end is it a means? This is the central problem of humanism outlined in Micheline Tison-Braun's La crise de l'humanisme: "C'est (l'humanisme) une morale ouverte, mais sur quoi?... l'humanisme en tant que doctrine n'a pas de base métaphysique qui lui soit propre"⁽¹³³⁾. Moreover, there is no clear view, on what kind of thought is being advocated. A philosophy based on the individual as the only value giver, cannot deny nihilism unless limits are placed on the individual's thought. For Guéhenno, this is an immediate problem as he is opposed to nihilism⁽¹³⁴⁾, although his pre-war friend André Thérive (admittedly speaking of Jeunesse de la France, a later text but one where similar ideas are expounded) notes that the basic principles of his philosophy admit it⁽¹³⁵⁾. Without constraints in the form of ideas, that is rules and limits, Man becomes a creature of impulses⁽¹³⁶⁾, so Guéhenno, not wanting individualism to become an anarchic principle, is forced to impose limits on the individual. The real problem here, is that twentieth century Man knows he possesses both conscious rational, and unconscious irrational characteristics, so making the individual the ultimate value-giver becomes increasingly problematic, as Malraux points out. Guéhenno implicitly accepts Malraux's view on the repercussions of the unconscious for a humanism based on the individual, but his reaction to this problem is to treat irrationality and the unconscious as alien forces which threaten the individual, rather than as the natural characteristics of Man: "La probité pour moi consiste à chasser (l'irrationnel) ou à le vaincre"⁽¹³⁷⁾. Guéhenno therefore imposes rationality as a framework for thought and action:

"(Les) docteurs peuvent bien nous crier que "la raison est illusoire, qu'elle nous perdra". Nous verrons bien... J'ai la faiblesse de tenir à de mystérieuses clartés que, j'ai péniblement acquises et je ne puis renoncer à la raison" (C.P. pp.72-73).

Such a limitation on the individual is valid in Guéhenno's view, because truth and justice, to which reason leads Man are, he believes, available to all: "la vérité n'exclut personne" (C.P. p.46). Furthermore, because he is concerned with the masses, he is confident that truth and reason will be accepted as limits on individual behaviour:

"Nul ne vole d'un vol plus droit vers la vérité (que Caliban). Les autres sont empêtrés dans tous leurs biens: ils doivent choisir entre elle et des mensonges profitables. Nous n'avons, nous à nous défaire de rien. Nous sommes libres" (C.P. p.30).

The "les autres" of this quotation, are the bourgeoisie: "Ils ne haïssent que la raison, cette étrangère... sans héritage qui voudrait toujours que tout recommençât. Nous n'en sommes pas encore là" (C.P. p.114). It is because Caliban is free that Guéhenno believes that truth as well as reason are safe, and an enlightened, tolerant future is possible:

"Tes maîtres (Caliban) ne t'ont à rien attaché, ni à une maison, ni à un champ, ni à une patrie. Ton amour est libre. Seul peut-être, sans manquer à rien ni à personne, tu peux penser pour l'humanité et sous l'aspect de l'éternel" (C.P. p.103).

Although he presents truth and reason as concrete desires present in the masses, there is no mistaking the essentially weak moral nature of his appeal in favour of these values:

"Je crains parfois que tu (Caliban) ne sois tenté par la facilité, par la médiocrité, que tu ne croies... qu'il faille, pour l'emporter, s'accommoder du réel et compter avec lui. Je te voudrais le plus fier utopiste qui soit au monde" (C.P. p.103).

The reference to the danger of facility is particularly important, as Guéhenno sees it, and "l'embourgeoisement" as the greatest dangers facing Caliban: "Je me serais moi-même embourgeoisé... Supposé ces propos vrais, ma défaite serait bien profonde" (C.P. p.6). This is a theme which Guéhenno greatly develops in his post-1945 works, especially in Caliban et Prospero.

Because rationality is presented as a moral imperative, Guéhenno has great difficulty in making it an effective limit recognised by all. The weakness in his argument is quite simply the lack of a firm justification for reason: "pour qui vient du néant et doit y retourner l'illusion (de la raison), si l'illusion il y a, a bien de charmes" (C.P. p.74). This is hardly a convincing argument in support of rationality. His position is further undermined by his own admission that circumstances are forcing Caliban to abandon reason: "Comment aimer toujours une raison qui le plus souvent ne domine que pour asservir?" (C.P. p.29). Nonetheless it must be realised that in considering the problem of reason, Guéhenno involves himself in an argument that dates back to the late nineteenth century, and that since that time, reason has been a contentious issue. According to Jean David: "L'intellectualisme du dix-huitième siècle... "raison", a duré jusque vers 1890"⁽¹³⁸⁾. This situation soon changed however, when Maurice Barrès launched his momentous attack on rationalism:

"La réaction qui confronta ce rationalisme ainsi que le changement des esprits furent dus, selon Charles Maurras, à Barrès et à Barrès seul et eurent lieu entre 1885 et 1895"(139).

The reaction against science and rationality begins in earnest in 1892/1893, leading to what Brunetière terms "la faillite de la science"(140), and by the twentieth century, the very word "raison" is abandoned, to be replaced by "l'intelligence"(141). "L'intelligence" becomes a popular subject for debate in the 1920s, extending to what Jean David describes as a general revaluation of the Western notion of Man: "le procès de l'intelligence s'est transformé peu à peu en celui de l'Occident"(142). Of more direct relevance to Guéhenno's own work, is the fact that when he was a student before the war, irrationalism was primarily a Right-wing tendency. As such it was politically unattractive to him, and this is why he chose a path similar to that of the Clarté group and the far Left, who revived the term "raison". They used the term in the sense of a will for social reform, opposing it to the then politically neutral "intelligence". Reason, "vieux de XVIII^e siècle a subi un glissement à gauche au vingtième"(143). Guéhenno's use of the word "raison", shows similarities with the Clarté definition, and this is particularly evident when he denies that bourgeois civilisation is a rational order: "c'est le désordre dont ils ont le privilège de jouir" (C.P. p.86).

The problem of reason, invites a comparison with Alain, who is a model for Guéhenno, owing to the biographical, as well as the ideological similarities between the two. Like Guéhenno, Alain served in the First World War, subsequently condemning

it⁽¹⁴⁴⁾, was a publicist⁽¹⁴⁵⁾, and taught in the same Lyceés: the Collège de Sévigné and the Lycée Henri IV⁽¹⁴⁶⁾. In the study of Alain undertaken by Georges Pascal, he is presented as a man who stresses the importance of thought, and believes reflection is the essence of Man, as it is a process by which Man "revient à soi", and realises that "l'homme est esprit"⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. Like Guéhenno, Alain believes that "penser... est le premier devoir (de l'homme)"⁽¹⁴⁸⁾, that Man is a consciousness⁽¹⁴⁹⁾, and that freedom is of supreme importance⁽¹⁵⁰⁾. He also believes that individuals are unique, and emphasises that although such feelings as melancholia are known to all, they vary in each individual⁽¹⁵¹⁾. Alain also presents a fully developed account of the necessity of reason, which is perfectly suited to Guéhenno's spiritual revolution. He claims that being human is being conscious, so reason alone is worthy of Man, because to reject reason is to indulge the passions which prevent Man becoming "maître de soi", and to escape into unconsciousness⁽¹⁵²⁾. Guéhenno was almost certainly familiar with Alain's arguments, as the two were acquainted during the inter-war years. In 1937, when Alain published his Souvenirs de guerre, he sent Guéhenno an autographed copy⁽¹⁵³⁾, and he had a number of his "Propos" published during Guéhenno's directorship of Vendredi.

In Caliban parle Guéhenno deliberately takes a number of ideas first mentioned in L'Évangile éternel in relation to Michelet, and develops them further. These include the problem of co-existence in a world without God, the solution of a contractual society, and the implications of such a solution for culture.

Furthermore Guehenno discusses in detail the problem of the "divorce" between culture and the masses, as well as Michelet's call for a culture relevant to all Men.

The starting point of Caliban parle is atheism, but Guéhenno's awareness of the legacy of religion, which involves an awareness of spiritual values, and of the importance of the personal response to all ideals, means that his goal of revolution, cannot be exclusively material. Revolution as understood by him, is a matter for the individual consciousness, and it is synonymous with acquiring a culture which Guéhenno believes is absolute. His insistence on the non-partisan nature of culture brings him into conflict with the communist view represented by Paul Nizan, but more importantly it leads him to condemn Soviet society for its indifference to spiritual values. Although in Caliban parle Guéhenno returns to Michelet's concerns about the "divorce" between culture and the masses, his solution to the problem is now only partly based on a restatement of Michelet's call for a relevant culture. Guéhenno defines culture as a truth seeking mentality, rather than as knowledge, and this enables him to argue that all men are cultured beings. This universalist and egalitarian approach also characterises Guéhenno's arguments in Caliban parle concerning the nature of social action. Despite still being an individualist, he now tries to reconcile individualism with social behaviour. Remembering the First World War, Guéhenno recounts his experience of fraternity, born from an awareness of a common destiny, and claims that all men are similar. This enables him to argue that self-interested

individual action can also be representative of the wishes of all men. He therefore anticipates Sartre's view of series in Critique de la raison dialectique, but his argument is not without certain problems. In presenting a justification of individualistic humanism, Guéhenno ignores the progress in psychology since the eighteenth century noted by Malraux, and fails to impose rationality as an effective limit on both the individual and society.

The principal ideas of Caliban parle, which are the definition of revolution as a personal ideal of spiritual self-improvement, the resulting awareness of the importance of culture, and the contractual view of society, are all critical to an understanding of Guéhenno's concerns in the inter-war years. Not surprisingly therefore, they are subsequently restated in his later works. In Conversion à l'humain, a sequel to Caliban parle written in 1931 in response to the letters Guéhenno received from his readers⁽¹⁵⁴⁾, he restates the earlier arguments on the problem of culture, but now places greater emphasis on his individualistic spiritual goals. He states that "la question n'est pas de former l'homme pour... l'État..., mais pour lui-même" (C.à H. p.194), and that: "ni la révolution politique, ni la révolution économique n'auraient tant d'importance si elles ne conduisaient à une révolution spirituelle" (C. à H. p.199). He also restates his view that culture is non-partisan: "le respect de l'esprit exige qu'on ne l'utilise, qu'on ne le mécanise jamais" (C. à H. p.210). Consequently Guéhenno again criticises the communists: "Les brochures de "la propagation de la foi", qu'elles soient jésuites

ou communistes, sont toujours des offenses à... l'homme (C. à H. p.210-211). Nonetheless in Conversion à l'humain he also expands his arguments on how the individual relates to society. To his earlier view that the similarity between individuals makes it possible for the individual to take part in collective action out of self-interest, he now adds the idea of transference.

The chief characteristic of transference is that it is a conscious acceptance by an individual of another person as being similar to himself, which in turn means that the individual is now aware that his private action is simultaneously of significance to others: "une âme vaut une autre âme. Je ne sais si tout le progrès de la pensée occidentale... n'a pas consisté à reconnaître ... les pathétiques enseignements de cette exigeante formule" (C. à H. p.152). Since transference gives the individual a sense of social responsibility for his actions, it is a major step in Guéhenno's development. Quite clearly he is moving away from individualistic isolation towards collective action, and is therefore preparing himself intellectually for the role of an "intellectuel engagé", which he is to play during the Front Populaire period.

The experience of fraternity which Guéhenno first felt in the trenches forms the basis of his contractual view of society, hence it is to be expected that he would want to return to the origins of this idea. This he does in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, where he not only acknowledges the solidarity he experienced during the war, but also gives a passionate statement of pacifism.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

1. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Louis Guilloux of the 11th August 1927, Guéhenno states: "Le Caliban en est toujours au même point". The date of this letter implies the book was begun in Lille. (Letter in the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
2. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Louis Guilloux, of the 19th January 1928. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
3. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Louis Guilloux, of the 13th November 1927, (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
4. See: F.D. p.90.
5. See also: F.D. p.92.
6. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Louis Guilloux of 1928, Guéhenno states: "Caliban sortira dans la première semaine de novembre". (Letter in the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
7. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Louis Guilloux, of the 3rd March 1929. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
8. Frédéric Lefèvre, "Une heure avec Robert Garric et Jean Guéhenno", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 2 février 1929.
9. Ernest Renan, L'Avenir de la Science. Paris, Calmann-Lévy, Oeuvres complètes, 1949. p.719.
10. Ibid., p.720.
11. See: H.W. Wardman, Ernest Renan - A Critical Biography, London, University of London, Athlone Press, 1964. p.49.

12. Donald G. Charlton, Positivist Thought in France 1852-1870.
Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1959. p.121. The latter part of this
quotation is from Ernest Renan, L'Avenir de la Science. Paris,
Calmann-Lévy, 1929.
13. See: Ernest Renan, L'Avenir de la Science, p.727.
14. See: *ibid.*, p.746.
15. See: H.W. Wardman, Ernest Renan - A Critical Biography, p.48.
16. Robert Kemp, "Caliban parle", Liberté, 17 décembre 1928.
17. For this information and source of quotation see: Albert Thibaudet,
"Caliban parle", Candide, 6 décembre 1928.
18. For Paul Souday's views and source of quotation see: Paul Souday,
"Caliban parle", Le Temps, 4 avril 1929.
19. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the
22nd December 1928. In Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.40.
20. See also: C.D.V.E. p.166, where Guéhenno states: "(Romain Rolland)
m'écrivit à propos de Caliban parle. Il m'approuvait mais regrettait
que je n'aie pas osé parler directement et en mon propre nom".
21. Frédéric Lefèvre, "Une heure avec Robert Garric et Jean Guéhenno",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 2 février 1929.
22. Albert Thibaudet, "Caliban parle", Candide, 6 décembre 1928.
23. Robert Kemp, "Caliban parle", Liberté, 17 décembre 1928.
24. See: J.R. p.27.
25. Jean Guehenno quoted in Frédéric Lefèvre, "Une heure avec
Robert Garric et Jean Guéhenno", Les Nouvelles Littéraires,
2 février 1929.

26. Ibid.
27. Jean Guéhenno quoted in Ibid.
28. Albert Camus, L'homme révolté. Paris, Gallimard, 1962. p.368.
29. Guéhenno admits later "d'avoir cru un peu trop... à la culture, et à cette révolution intellectuelle qu'elles donnent à chacun les moyens d'opérer en lui-même... une sorte d'ivresse me fit croire que c'était là toute la Révolution". C. & P. p.18.
30. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan, of about 1930. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
See also: Frédéric Lefèvre, "Une heure avec Robert Garric et Jean Guehenno", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 2 février 1929.
31. Louis-Ferdinand Céline, Mea Culpa. In Oeuvres de Céline, Edition présentée par Frédéric Vitoux, Paris, Aux Éditions du Club de l'Honnête Homme, 1981 tome 4, p.100.
32. Guéhenno is described as a humanist concerned with culture.
See: Lucie Mazauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.76.
33. See: David Cauter, Communism and the French Intellectuals 1914-1960. London, André Deutsch, 1964. p.136.
34. Ramon Fernandez, "Caliban parle", La Nouvelle Revue Française, XXXII, 1 février 1929, pp. 259-260.
35. Ibid., p.260.
36. Ibid., p.260.
37. Ibid., p.262.
38. Ibid., p.261.
39. Ibid., p.260.

40. Ibid., p.261.
41. Albert Thibaudet, "Caliban parle", Candide, 6 décembre 1928.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid.
44. Frédéric Lefèvre, "Une heure avec Robert Garric et Jean Guéhenno"
Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 2 février 1929.
45. Ibid.
46. From the unpublished Jean Guéhenno, "L'Art et le peuple au XIX
siècle" (Discours prononcé à la radio le 5 mai 1931) p.XI.
(In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
47. Ibid., p.IV.
48. Ibid., p.111.
49. Ibid., p.111.
50. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lectures. Littérature prolétarienne",
Europe, 15 décembre 1931, pp.568-575. This article includes the
text of the Kharkov resolution. See also: Jean Guéhenno, "Notes
de lectures. Littérature prolétarienne II", Europe, 15 janvier 1932,
pp. 111-116.
51. See: David Caute, Communism and the French Intellectuals
1914-1960, p.318.
52. See: Paul Nizan, Les chiens de garde. Paris, Maspero, 1969. p.11.
53. See: *ibid.*, p.12.
54. See: *ibid.*, p.20.
55. See: *ibid.*, p.14.
56. See: *ibid.*, p.23.
57. See: *ibid.*, p.75.

58. See: *ibid.*, p.81.
59. See the later section of this chapter on rationality.
60. Paul Nizan, Les chiens de garde, p.114.
61. Emmanuel Berl, "Conversion à l'humain", Les Nouvelles Littéraires 29 août 1931.
62. Emmanuel Berl, "Mort de la morale bourgeoise", Europe, 15 novembre 1929, p.369.
63. *Ibid.*, p.363
64. See earlier discussion of this problem.
65. See: Julien Benda, La trahison des clercs. Paris, Jean-Jacques Pauvert, 1965. p.40.
66. See: *ibid.*, p.45.
67. See: *ibid.*, p.67.
68. *Ibid.*, p.63.
69. See: *ibid.*, p.145.
70. See: *ibid.*, p.135.
71. See: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society, p.414.
72. Jean Sarocchi, Julien Benda-Portrait d'un intellectuel. Paris, A.G. Nizet, 1968. p.29.
73. See: H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society, p.417
74. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lectures. Lettre ouverte à Julien Benda", Europe, 15 février 1930, pp.269-270.
75. Albert Camus, La Peste. Paris, Gallimard, 1963, p.331.
76. *Ibid.*, p.323.
77. Julien Benda, "Lettre à Jean Guéhenno", La Nouvelle Revue Française, XXXIV, avril 1930, pp.553-561.

78. Ibid., p.561.
79. Ibid., p.558.
80. Julien Benda, "Culture et Bourgeoisie. Lettre à J. Guéhenno",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires 2 février 1929, p.1.
81. Ibid., p.1.
82. Paul Souday, "Caliban parle", Le Temps, 4 avril 1929.
83. Robert Kemp, "Caliban parle", Liberté, 17 décembre 1928.
84. Ibid.
85. Eg. Julien Benda, who sees culture as partly involving an
irrational "sensibilité".
86. Jean Guéhenno, "L'art et le peuple au XIX siècle"
87. See: H. Stuart Hughes, The Obstructed Path, p.108.
88. Guéhenno also repeatedly asked Martin du Gard to write for
Europe. This is stated in the unpublished letters from
Jean Guéhenno to Roger Martin du Gard of the 8th November
1930, the 1st December 1930, and the 25th February 1931.
(All in the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
89. Guéhenno read Nietzsche at the École Normale and retained
a life long interest in him. In Carnets du vieil écrivain
he refers to "cette page de Nietzsche que j'ai trouvé en
1925 et qui définit" le livre parfait"" C.D.V.E. p.133.
90. See: Friedrich Nietzsche, Parable of the Madman in The Joyful
Wisdom, Trans. Thomas Cannon. London, T.N. Foulis, 1910.
pp. 167-169.
91. See: Walter Kaufmann, Nietzsche - Philosopher, Psychologist,
Antichrist. Cleveland and New York, World Publishing Co.
coll. "Meridian Books", 1966. p.84.

92. Friedrich Nietzsche, Ecce Homo. 1908, II. I. Quoted in
Walter Kaufmann, Nietzsche - Philosopher, Psychologist,
Antichrist. p.84.
93. Charles Andler, Nietzsche - sa vie et sa pensée. Paris, Gallimard,
1958. vol. III. p.103.
94. This is a point of view for which Guéhenno is indebted to his
father: "C'est lui le premier qui m'enseigna que les vrais
dieux sont ceux que nous nous inventons" J.40. p.72.
95. See: Julien Benda, "Lettre à Jean Guéhenno, La Nouvelle Revue
Française, XXXIV, avril 1930, p.560.
96. Alain Silvera claims that in his biography of Nietzsche,
Halévy presents Nietzsche as the philosopher who posed the
question: "Can man be ennobled?" Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy
and his times, p.209.
97. See: *ibid.*, p.74.
98. Friedrich Nietzsche, La Volonté de puissance. Paris, tome 1,
p.19. Quoted in C.D.V.E. pp.133-134.
99. Pierre de Boisdeffre, Barrès parmi nous. Paris, Plon, 1969. p.78.
100. See the earlier discussion of the concept of revolution in
Caliban parle.
101. This was stated in conversation with the author by
Mme. Annie Guéhenno on the 8th May 1984.
102. Jean-Paul Sartre, La Nausée. Paris, Livre de Poche, 1959. p.162.
103. See: Jean-Paul Sartre, Critique de la raison dialectique.
Paris, Gallimard, 1960. p.60.

104. See: Raymond Aron, History and the Dialectic of Violence.
Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1975. p.25.
105. See: *ibid.*, p.55.
106. See: *ibid.*, p.15.
107. See: Jean-Paul Sartre, Critique de la Raison dialectique,
p.383. Sartre states: "le rassemblement inerte avec sa
structure de serialité est le type fondamental de la
socialité".
108. See: Raymond Aron, History and the Dialectic of Violence, p.55.
109. Jean-Paul Sartre, Critique de la raison dialectique, p.381.
110. See: *ibid.*, p.393.
111. See: *ibid.*, p.399. Sartre states: "A ce niveau, chacun en
tant que tiers ne peut plus distinguer sa propre sauvegarde
et celle des Autres".
112. A. Sheridan Smith, Glossary in his translation of
Jean-Paul Sartre, Critique of Dialectical Reason. London,
N.L.B., 1976. p.829.
113. See: Raymond Aron, History and the Dialectic of Violence, p.61.
114. See: *ibid.*, p.59.
115. See: Jean-Paul Sartre, Critique de la raison dialectique,
pp. 421-422.
116. See: Raymond Aron, History and the Dialectic of Violence, p.60.
117. See: *ibid.*, p.202.
118. See: Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme. Paris,
Librairie Nizet, 1958. tome II, pp.450-451.
119. See: *ibid.*, p.7.

120. See: *ibid.*, p.12.
121. Joseph Hoffman, L'Humanisme de Malraux. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1963. p.11.
122. Guéhenno and Malraux corresponded throughout the period 1930-1975. (This correspondence is in the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
123. Joseph Hoffman, L'Humanisme de Malraux, p.66.
124. André Malraux, La tentation de L'Occident. Paris, Grasset, 1956. p.151.
125. André Malraux quoted in Joseph Hoffman, L'Humanisme de Malraux, p.67.
126. André Malraux, La tentation de L'Occident, p.94.
127. See: Joseph Hoffman, L'Humanisme de Malraux, pp.37-39.
128. *Ibid.*, p.283.
129. See: Pierre de Boisdeffre, Métamorphose de la littérature. Paris, Alsatia, 1963. p.26.
130. Joseph Hoffman, L'Humanisme de Malraux, p.289.
131. André Malraux, La tentation de L'Occident, p.46
132. See: Joseph Hoffman, L'Humanisme de Malraux, pp.41-45
133. Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme, tome II, pp. 9-10.
134. See: *ibid.*, p.223.
135. See: André Thérive, "Jeunesse de la France", Le Temps, 28 mai 1936, p.3.
136. Manheim quoted in H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society, p.424.

137. Jean Guéhenno quoted in Frédéric Lefèvre, "Une heure avec Robert Garric et Jean Guéhenno", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 2 février 1929.
138. Jean David, Le procès de l'intelligence .Paris, Librairie Nizet, 1966. p.59.
139. Ibid., p.60.
140. Brunetière quoted in Pierre de Boisdeffre, Métamorphose de la littérature, p.59.
141. See: Jean David, Le procès de l'intelligence, p.11.
142. Ibid., p.221. For loss of faith in scientific thought see also: André Malraux, "D'une jeunesse européenne", Ecrits, Les Cahiers Verts, 70, Paris, Grasset, 1927, p.145-150.
143. Jean David, Le procès de L'intelligence, pp. 324-326.
144. See: Georges Pascal, La pensée d'Alain. Paris, Bordas, coll: "Collection pour connaître", 1957. p.20.
145. See: Alain, Libres Propos, 1921 in ibid., p.23.
146. See: Alain, Libres Propos, 1921 in ibid., p.23.
147. Georges Pascal, La pensée d'Alain, p.48.
148. Ibid., p.95.
149. See: ibid., p.52. Alain is quoted as stating that:
"un philosophe... se sait esprit, c'est à dire homme".
150. See: ibid., p.40.
151. See: ibid., p.125.
152. See: ibid., p.164.
153. See: L.M.D.A. p.134.
154. See: C. à H. p.121. Guéhenno refers to the letters he received from his readers, which were "si merveilleusement exigeantes"

Chapter Four

Journal d'un homme de 40 ans

There is no doubt that the months which he spent in the trenches during 1914-1915 constitute a decisive experience in the life of Guéhenno, with far-reaching consequences for his subsequent thought. It is therefore appropriate, that his first extended piece of post-war writing should have been devoted to memories of that critical period: "Pour ma part, mon premier travail (après la guerre) fut d'écrire une sorte de roman lyrique que j'intitulai: La Jeunesse morte. Je le portai à un éditeur. Il n'en voulut pas" (L.M.D.A. p.188). This early unpublished work prefigures Journal d'un homme de 40 ans in two important respects: it deals with the subject of the First World War and it is an autobiographical novel⁽¹⁾. Since the war to which the second part of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is devoted, is such a major problem for Guéhenno, references to it are to be found in his early published texts even though these texts deal with other matters. In the prologue to L'Évangile éternel Guéhenno states that the soldiers of 1914 "ne se sacrifiaient pas; ils étaient sacrifiés" (E.E. Prologue). Nevertheless in this same prologue he also claims that war breeds solidarity among men and that this solidarity gives Mankind hope for the future, a fact which has been noted before: "un sentiment nouveau les domine: ils "coexistent" " (E.E. Prologue). This latter theme is taken up in Caliban parle: "j'ai, pour moi, rattrapé en ces années de honte la fraternité" (C.P. p.41). Caliban parle is also the text where Guéhenno puts forward his view that the war was fought to protect purely bourgeois interests: "Nos maîtres nous dirent que nous avions part à leur querelle et nous eûmes d'abord la naïveté de les croire" (C.P. p.40).

Nonetheless, after the failure of La Jeunesse morte, Guéhenno waited until late 1934 before publishing a work on the subject of the First World War. He began work on Journal d'un homme de 40 ans in August 1931, at which time he informed Romain Rolland that he was thinking of writing the memoirs of a man of 40, who would also be "le plus humble des Européens"⁽²⁾. By May 1933 "La cantique de l'arc", the ninth chapter, was completed⁽³⁾ and the whole book was finished by September 1934⁽⁴⁾. Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, which with Caliban parle is Guéhenno's best known work, became an immediate success⁽⁵⁾ and it helped make pacifism a major literary subject between the wars⁽⁶⁾. From Guéhenno's point of view this success was unexpected. In a letter to his friend Louis Guilloux written before publication, he writes: "Je travaille au Journal... Je ne l'ai pas montré à Malraux - je crains qu'il ne l'aime pas et cela m'ennuierait"⁽⁷⁾. André Malraux took a keen interest in the book's progress, asking Guéhenno for the proofs⁽⁸⁾, and later he wrote an article on it for the Nouvelle Revue Française. In a letter to Jean Giono, Guéhenno is full of doubts about his latest work: "J'ai achevé péniblement le Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. C'est triste et noir"⁽⁹⁾. This did not however prevent him from doing his best to advertise its publication. In a letter to Jean Paulhan, the editor of the Nouvelle Revue Française, he declines Paulhan's offer to publish a part of the work in his review on the grounds that he does not want it fragmented. Guéhenno's intention at this time was to publish the whole of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans in Europe⁽¹⁰⁾ and this is what actually happened. The book appeared in parts, in the August, September, October and November editions of 1934, which coincided

with its official publication by Grasset in the last quarter of that year⁽¹¹⁾.

Journal d'un homme de 40 ans claims to be an autobiography dealing with the period of Guéhenno's life from his birth to the end of the First World War, but it is clearly a structured and selective interpretation of his early life. The account is therefore arranged in such a way as to give the impression of a progressive descent into misery. After the brief period of happiness in Peñné, Guéhenno presents the reader with the already noted experiences of poverty in F. and his even bleaker years in the shoe factory. Although the change in fortune represented by his studies at the École Normale Supérieure is acknowledged by him, he plays down its significance, concentrating instead on the most miserable period of his life - service in the trenches of the First World War. The theme of the descent into increasing misery which is implicit in the structure of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is made explicit in Guéhenno's reflections on the aftermath of the war. He claims that it was fought for no good reason, and is shocked that: "les pères... supportent mieux la mort de leurs fils que la perte de leur argent" (J.40. p.225). He also rejects the materialistic post-war society which he realises is accepted by all social classes, hence he looks to the Soviet Union for hope, in a manner that invites a comparison with Louis Guilloux's Le Sang Noir. Nevertheless Guéhenno ends Journal d'un homme de 40 ans with a very pessimistic view of the future. He breaks the narrative of earlier events with news items of 1933, which suggests that

the world is once again drifting towards war. Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is a deliberately bleak view of Guéhenno's life, but since he claims that his autobiography is representative of his generation, his book is also a general expression of disillusion with society. This is clearly seen in the last pages of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, where Guéhenno gives an almost fatalistic account of what he has learnt from life: "il en est de nobles et d'ignobles. Ce sont de ces naïvetés que m'a apprises la vie. C'est là toute ma science après quarante ans" (J.40. p.255).

The problems raised by Journal d'un homme de 40 ans may be conveniently divided into those arising from Guéhenno's account of his pre-1914 life and those arising from the presentation of his war experiences. With respect to the first part of the book the major questions are individualism, especially its effect on the conceptions of "Patrie" and "Révolution" developed in the three preceding works, autobiography and "déclassement". The effect of all these problems on the style of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is also a matter of importance, as are the possible evaluations of this work which raise the issue of its fictionality. In the second part of Guéhenno's book, his approach to the presentation of war and his critique of it become the major areas of interest, as they situate this work within the context of inter-war pacifist literature. Nevertheless, Guéhenno's didactic message, his presentation of post-war society and the deeply pessimistic ending of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans are also matters of importance, because through them the Journal can be related to his most basic concerns of the 1930s.

Although throughout his life Guéhenno denied that he was an individualist there is no doubt that the term individualism best describes his attitude. Gabriel Marcel emphasises this fact in his review of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans for Europe Nouvelle: "Jamais l'auteur ne me semble avoir fait le moindre effort pour... chercher à imaginer ce que serait ce monde pour d'autres yeux que les siens"⁽¹²⁾. André Thérive, writing for Le Temps states that for Guéhenno the influence of Barrès is clearly a permanent aspect of his thought: "Barrès... dont M. Guéhenno hait les doctrines, est absous, au fond, comme professeur de la vie intérieure"⁽¹³⁾. Furthermore, for the Figaro critic individualism is a strength of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans: "ce livre est le meilleur de M. Guéhenno jusqu'à présent, parce qu'il y parle, cette fois, sans personne interposée... du sujet qui lui tient le plus à coeur: de lui-même"⁽¹⁴⁾. This view is shared by René Lalou in his article for Les Nouvelles Littéraires: "Jean Guéhenno nous donne son meilleur livre et tout le meilleur de lui-même"⁽¹⁵⁾. Guéhenno liked Lalou's article, and wrote to him thanking him for it⁽¹⁶⁾.

Guéhenno's attitude is particularly clear in the first part of his work where he describes his childhood in a village which is undoubtedly Peñé⁽¹⁷⁾. The fact that he presents it as a golden age of unbridled egotism is to be expected in the light of the known biographical facts, but the account of his life in the country also fulfills an important general function in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. This is because it implicitly supports the argument that happiness and fulfilment are only possible if the individual has the greatest possible

degree of freedom. Guéhenno was only free as a child in the country, hence: "jamais je (n'étais) sur la terre un personnage plus important qu'en ce temps-là" (J.40.p.23).

A counterpart to the village is provided by the description of life in a provincial town⁽¹⁸⁾. Once again Guéhenno draws on his personal experiences to make a general point. When he recalls that after the freedom of the country his parents' flat was "une prison" (J.40.p.58), he consciously uses the Maison Bruant as a symbol of the urban civilisation which he condemns. This is why Gabriel Marcel quotes Guéhenno's view that: "Dès qu'elle le peut la civilisation nous passe son carcan au cou"⁽¹⁹⁾. Such a sentiment invites André Thérive to refer to "L'humanitarisme, l'anarchisme plutôt (de Guéhenno)"⁽²⁰⁾.

Whereas the description of a rural childhood cannot be taken as conclusive proof of Guéhenno's individualism as all small children are self-centred, the fact that social progress in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is presented as a wholly individual achievement, gives substance to such a proposition. J.B. Séverac, reviewing the book for Le Populaire, refers to "les deux libérations (de Jean Guéhenno)... celle de l'école d'abord, puis celle des livres"⁽²¹⁾. This is true, but what is more important is that education for Guéhenno is a personal and solitary mission, which enables him to escape the destiny of the factory:

"Une nuit de janvier 1905, ma décision se trouva prise... Il ne se pouvait pas que le monde fût si borné et si sombre. Quelque part un esprit devait exister qui purifie, ordonne, fait la justice et la lumière. Et je partis à sa recherche... Qu'importe le détail de mes lectures. J'étais ivre de ma liberté, de n'appartenir enfin qu'à moi-même" (J.40.p.107).

In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno illustrates his argument that progress is an individual matter with recollections of his early studies. He betters himself by isolating himself from the world and he even resents his mother's voice breaking the silence of his nocturnal reading, because "elle détruisait le charme de ma solitude" (J.40. p.108). At this stage in his life reading is a freedom and freedom only has meaning in an individual sense. When he eventually enters the École Normale Supérieure Guéhenno is happy because: "je n'ai plus de maître, plus de patron" (J.40. p.138). Although in his book Guéhenno emphasises the immense personal effort involved in getting an education and gaining admission to the École Normale Supérieure, his case was by no means unique as the system of grants enabled many poor students to study there⁽²²⁾. Albert Thibaudet, who discusses this matter in La République des professeurs refers specifically to Guéhenno, naming him as one whose academic career was made possible by the "bourses"⁽²³⁾.

Given his personal circumstances and social origins, the acquisition of knowledge is in Guéhenno's case directly related to a better life, hence the importance placed on reason and knowledge in his work. Since Journal d'un homme de 40 ans deals with the period prior to his leaving the École Normale, Guéhenno has not yet had a chance to profit from academic success, so education is necessarily presented as a goal in itself. This is a perfectly logical position for him to take, as the process of education has already borne fruit, because he is no longer working in the factory. André Malraux rightly believes that

Guéhenno's purpose in his book is "l'expérience de la recherche d'une sagesse"⁽²⁴⁾. This search is however an individual one.

Guéhenno's individualistic outlook affects his view of "la patrie":

"Ces monstres que les politiques, les financiers, les journalistes, rapetassant mal quelques lambeaux d'histoire, composaient pour justifier des sottises ou des profits (de guerre) n'étaient pas des patries" (J.40. p.188).

This is why the Figaro critic claims that Guéhenno's "notion de (la) patrie se réduit à "une grande chose douce qui n'avait besoin pour durer de la mort de personne"....(mais) la non résistance au mal entraîne souvent le triomphe du mal..."⁽²⁵⁾. Nevertheless "la patrie" is clearly for him a spiritual and hence a personal ideal, based on values rather than on race. The same is also true of his view of revolution, which is essentially that of Caliban parle and is to be understood as a personal search for truth and dignity:

"La seule révolution dont je me sente un bon ouvrier, c'est la révolution qu'opère lentement dans le monde la recherche de la vérité... Grâce à elle, ce qu'il y a de plus humain, selon Nietzsche, sera un jour accompli: un temps viendra où sera épargnée à tout homme la honte" (J.40. p.242).

Robert Brasillach, a fascist writer sympathetic to the workers⁽²⁶⁾ and a collaborator of L'Action Française, draws attention to the origins of Guéhenno's view of revolution as presented in the first part of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, where "M. Guéhenno parle de ses parents, (et) de leur foi naïve... en un monde meilleur, en une révolution mystique"⁽²⁷⁾. This faith, especially

that of his father, permanently influences Guéhenno's views:

"L'audace et les entreprises de mon père
(dans les syndicats) ne faisaient que le
compromettre. Mais peu à peu aussi j'entrai
dans les soucis et les passions de mon père.
Étions-nous donc des chiens pour ne penser
qu'à notre pâtée?" (J.40. p.71).

For both father and son revolution is to be supported because justice demands it, so there is no question of tactical considerations. Guéhenno believes the masses share his faith and that when they fight for better material conditions they also "rêvent d'un autre monde" (J.40. p.112). Given his political views, Robert Brasillach is not surprisingly dismissive of Guéhenno's views, classifying him as "un révolutionnaire larmoyant"⁽²⁸⁾. Nonetheless even André Thérive, who is usually sympathetic to Guéhenno's opinions, believes that his view of revolution "rend un son... sentimental"⁽²⁹⁾.

Brasillach's most pertinent point is the comparison which he draws between Guéhenno and the syndicalist "normaliens" of Jules Romains' Les Hommes de Bonne Volonté⁽³⁰⁾. It is a comparison which is also made by Robert Kemp, who refers to Romains in his critique of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, published in La Liberté: "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans est certes l'oeuvre d'un homme de bonne volonté... Mais le regard est limité"⁽³¹⁾. The reference to the concept of "un homme de bonne volonté", represented in Romains' novel by Dr. Viaur is important, because it is one which Guéhenno encourages. The model of a person "qui bien fait son tâche" and respects human life, thought and truth⁽³²⁾, is almost synonymous with Guéhenno's own humanist ideal. There is

good reason to suspect that the parallels between Les Hommes de Bonne Volonté and Guéhenno's work are more than coincidental. Guéhenno was a friend of Romains' as well as his tenant at Belleville⁽³³⁾.

Guéhenno's ideological roots as well as his understanding of revolution are to be found in the eighteenth century humanist tradition. André Thérive, considering Guéhenno's hopes for a post-revolutionary world, states: "pour M. Guéhenno ce qui... viendra semble être l'humanitarisme"⁽³⁴⁾. He also draws attention to the presence of Rousseau's ideas in Guéhenno's work:

"La notion de l'homme sans biens, sans intérêts, sans culture, sans patrie... qu'il faut sauver et qui nous sauverait. C'est la vieille idée rousseauiste. Et puis encore le désir qu'a l'auteur (Guéhenno) de se sentir "justifié" devant la nuit, devant le printemps, devant la jeunesse comme Jean-Jacques devant sa pervenche..."⁽³⁵⁾.

The closing lines of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans do indeed evoke the memory of a lonely and dejected Rousseau - the Rousseau whom Guéhenno most admired for his refusal to surrender to an unjust world:

"O nuit que nous apprends à murmurer les paroles éternelles, c'est devant toi que je voudrais me savoir justifié. Le monde, le jour nous méprisent et nous raillent. Mais certaine force qui est en nous et contre laquelle rien ne peut rien est accordé à la lumière" (J.40. p.259).

Nonetheless it is worth remembering that this is not a mere literary phrase overladen with pathos, but a reference to childhood memories of solitary study, when Guéhenno would open

his window and realise that he and an engine driver were the only beings still awake: "je pensais au mécanicien... comme à un complice. La belle nuit nous appartenait" (J.40. p.108).

Since Guéhenno is an individualist who consciously aims to improve himself spiritually and, inevitably, also in a social sense, autobiographical writing is very appropriate to him: "Une assez longue pratique des livres des autres m'a convaincu que nous n'avions guère qu'une chose à dire, et c'est nous-mêmes" (J.40. p.13). As autobiographical writing is evidently a conscious choice made by Guéhenno, André Rousseaux writing for Le Figaro, quotes this statement by Guéhenno to substantiate his claim that the latter is one of those for whom "l'oeuvre compte moins que le culte de la personnalité"⁽³⁶⁾. The tone of Rousseaux's statement clearly implies a criticism of Guéhenno, but for Georges May the "culte de la personnalité" is an integral part of the autobiographical genre. May traces the origins of autobiographical writing to "la pratique de l'examen de conscience préconisée par l'ascèse chrétienne"⁽³⁷⁾. Equally importantly he associates autobiography with individualism: "la tradition autobiographique dans les lettres européennes a bénéficié principalement des progrès de l'individualisme"⁽³⁸⁾. Guéhenno's use of the genre is therefore conventional, so it is quite acceptable for Rousseaux to claim that Guéhenno's work is "autoguéhennographique", or at best "guéhennocentrique"⁽³⁹⁾. Rousseaux does however raise a further problem when he states that: "pour nous aider à prendre à sa personne autant d'intérêt qu'il en prend lui-même, (Guéhenno) s'identifie à d'importants

objets: il est le Peuple, il est l'Europe"⁽⁴⁰⁾. In May's opinion this desire to include Mankind in general in the discussion of a single life is also a characteristic of autobiography: "le récit qu'a fait l'auteur de sa propre vie a pour vertu peut-être inattendue.. de refléter aussi, quoique d'une autre manière, celle de son lecteur"⁽⁴¹⁾. His opinion is moreover supported by Simone de Beauvoir in her La force de l'âge: "si un individu s'expose avec sincérité, tout le monde... se trouve mis en jeu. Impossible de faire la lumière sur sa vie sans éclairer, ici ou là, celle des autres"⁽⁴²⁾. Far from being an expression of self-indulgence, autobiographical writing can legitimately be seen as an attempt to speak for all men and it is in this sense that Guéhenno uses it throughout his life. An individualist intellectually as well as emotionally, he believes that his writing can have a social significance if it raises general problems, but he can only express these concerns through his personal experience, which is why he chooses the autobiographical genre and why his works are a constant rewriting of his autobiography.

The assertion that Guéhenno presents himself as an individualist in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans requires a major qualification, because for André Thérive he is "un individualiste chagrin"⁽⁴³⁾, or more appropriately an "individualiste déclassé". The problem, as Gabriel Marcel notes in his article for Europe Nouvelle, is not merely one of inability to come to terms with his humble origins: "Louis Gillet... accuse gratuitement M. Guéhenno de n'avoir jamais pu accepter ses humbles origines... (mais) il y a là une interprétation... tendancieuse et conventionnelle

d'un cas beaucoup plus complexe"⁽⁴⁴⁾. Guéhenno's case is unusual because he suffers from a guilt complex associated with "déclassement" and personal success. It appears therefore that in his first autobiography Guéhenno is still grappling with the problem which first troubled him at the Lycée de Rennes and which became acute at the École Normale Supérieure. He remembers holidays spent with his mother when he was a university student as times when he was torn between contradictory emotions: "Il m'était insupportable de sentir continuellement et si près de moi toute la misère du monde, tandis que loin d'elle j'aurais éprouvé peut-être à la penser une sorte de satisfaction" (J.40. p.141). In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno cannot accept his own "déclassement" because he notices that the way in which his mother and his old working-class friends look at him has changed, as they no longer accept him as one of their own. André Thérive believes that "Guéhenno est donc persuadé que changer de classe c'est changer d'âme"⁽⁴⁵⁾, but this does not prevent Guéhenno making frantic and ultimately vain efforts to resist the process of "déclassement", in as far as it involves a change of attitudes.

The problem of "déclassement" constitutes one of the major issues in Guéhenno's latest work, but it can only be understood if the experience of poverty as a decisive factor in his psychological make up is taken into consideration. René Lalou in his article for Les Nouvelles Littéraires claims that "Guéhenno a été façonné par deux grandes épreuves: la pauvreté et la guerre"⁽⁴⁶⁾. In the first part of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno uses his recollections of the experiences of his parents in the 1890s to give a moving account of the effect of poverty on a working-class

family. His mother, whose need to work has been noted earlier, therefore figures prominently in the book: "Ma mère ne laissait rien perdre... Dès cinq heures du matin, elle était à sa machine et pédalait, jusqu'à onze heures du soir" (J.40. p.63). Poverty involves more than material deprivation however, as it also breaks the spirit. Guéhenno recalls: "ce fut ma mère qui m'habitua à cette basse lumière" (J.40. p.63), "il m'est arrivé de faire à ma mère des reproches: "Maman, tu travailles trop. Tu ne sais pas vivre". Elle levait les yeux, ses lèvres se tordaient, et, en retenant un sanglot: "Je ne suis heureuse qu'à ma brouette", répondait-elle" (J.40. p.64).

Nevertheless despite the early impression which his mother's attitude made on him, the argument which Guéhenno puts forward in his autobiography is that he soon came under the spell of his father, who took a different view of life. He taught his son that "les vrais dieux sont ceux que nous nous inventons" (J.40. p.72), which awakened in him "ces vagues désirs qui, pour l'homme le plus humble, sont encore une fortune et témoignent que l'âme la plus accablée n'est pas encore anéantie" (J.40. pp.71-72). At the same time, however, in the account given in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno's father never abandoned the working masses in his search for a better life, preferring instead to fight with them as one of their number: "il était un "meneur"... Son crime avait été de prendre au sérieux la loi sur les associations et de fonder à F... un syndicat" (J.40. p.70)⁽⁴⁷⁾. The view of poverty is by no means romanticised as it is the misery and humiliation of poverty which Guéhenno emphasises. This is why Robert Brasillach

praises "la première partie, de beaucoup la meilleure", because it is "assez près de la réalité"⁽⁴⁸⁾. The family's lodgings are honestly described as "cette cellule sale" (J.40. p.61), and there is a detailed account of the shame experienced by Guéhenno's father when he is forced to abandon his principles and become a strike-breaker. In what is the most moving scene of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, Guéhenno uses this traumatic experience from his past to illustrate the importance of dignity and honour for the working-classes. When he describes how hunger forced his father back to work he presents the defeat as a matter of honour:

"Mon père... sortit. Il rentra une heure après, jeta sa toilette pleine sur la table et nous dit avec une sorte de haine: "Tenez, vous en voulez de l'ouvrage. En voilà!" Oui, je crois qu'il nous haïssait en ce moment-là, parce que nous l'avions obligé à se déshonorer" (J.40. p.76) (49).

The desire to save her husband's honour whilst avoiding hunger, is also what drives Guéhenno's mother to rise from her sick-bed and attempt to walk to work. The essential aspect of Guéhenno's presentation of poverty in his autobiography is that he sees it as an indignity rather than as a material problem. This is evident not only from the account of his father's strike-breaking, but also from his description of what happened several years later, when with his father ill he pleaded for a pay rise:

"Les plaintes de ma mère me décidaient parfois à aller demander au patron de "l'augmentation". Je me souviens de ces démarches comme des plus humiliantes... de ma vie... (Mon patron) m'eût plus facilement fait la charité d'un billet de mille francs que donné cinq francs de plus pour mon travail" (J.40. p.104).

As a witness to the great strike in the shoe industry of F. in 1906-1907 Guéhenno saw suffering all around him. In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans he pities the mothers who are forced to send their children away: "la ville se dépeupla d'enfants. On les envoya à Paris, à Nantes, à Rennes, où le pain était mieux assuré" (J.40. p.117). At the same time, remembering his family's own experiences, Guéhenno is especially moved by the sight of "une jeune femme, une "jaune", qu'une bande d'ouvriers et d'ouvrières avait serrée contre le mur et couvrait de crachats. Je me mis à courir. J'avais honte..." (J.40. p.116). The treatment of poverty as an indignity in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is noted by Malraux, who claims that: "le ton de ce livre-ci a cette dignité de porter sans cesse le sourd écho de la phrase que répondit Nietzsche lorsqu'on lui demanda "ce qui était le plus important": "Epargner à tout homme la honte"" (50).

Continuing poverty on a massive scale coupled with his own social and material advancement, gives rise to a guilt complex in Guéhenno. This is compounded by the fact that he knows he does not have a clear conscience regarding the workers. The 1906-1907 strike, a time of misery for most, enabled Guéhenno to pursue his private studies, so in his autobiography he confesses:

"Toute la population de F... connut les plus grandes souffrances. Pour moi, je ne suis pas sûr de ne m'être pas quelquefois réjoui de la liberté que ce repos forcé me donna... assis devant ma fenêtre presque tout le long du jour, dans mes mains un livre... La misère humaine autour de moi ne m'était de rien" (J.40. pp.112-113).

Guéhenno's solitary study is a heroic and divine struggle, but it is a purely personal one: "Dans ma chambre étroite... j'étais une

sorte de Dieu" (J.40. p.112). This fact, however, only serves to reinforce Guéhenno's guilt complex, which is a very real and deeply-felt problem for him and which manifests itself in his work of the 1930s as a great fear of betraying the working masses. Gabriel Marcel is therefore correct when he claims that "la terreur constante de M. Guéhenno... c'est de trahir les siens, ceux qu'il s'obstine à regarder comme les siens"⁽⁵¹⁾. From the account given in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans it is clear that the origin of this fear is to be found in the attitude displayed by Guéhenno's mother, who tells him: "Tu ne nous aimes pas, me dit-elle un jour... Si tu nous aimais tu accepterais de vivre comme nous avons tous vécu... Roture oblige autant que noblesse. Je trahissais⁷¹ (J.40. p.110-111). As a student Guéhenno feels unease before the workers:

"Aux heures où les ouvriers, mes camarades d'hier, sortaient des usines... je ne sais quelle inquiétude me jetait dans la rue à leur rencontre. Je marchais sans lever les yeux, sans oser seulement les regarder. Je me sentais suspect" (J.40. p.141).

Nonetheless the truth is that the increasing distance between himself and the masses, means that it is a memory of the workers rather than the aspirations of the contemporary worker, which he fears betraying. The guilt Guéhenno feels before his ancestors is particularly revealing in this respect:

"D'innombrables ancêtres dont je n'avais pas même le portrait... avaient végété autour d'un calvaire... La seule élévation que puisse comprendre un vieux peuple... n'est pas celle de l'intelligence, mais celle du coeur... Et si j'ai fini par conquérir la liberté de l'esprit, je me dis quelquefois que ce ne fut... qu'en devenant un mauvais enfant" (J.40. p.111).

The politically partisan Brasillach dismisses Guéhenno's guilt complex as idiosyncratic: "cette tendance un peu fâcheuse à se frapper la poitrine, à dire: moi-le-peuple et à regretter publiquement de bien dîner"⁽⁵²⁾. This does not however make it any less real and an appreciation of the guilt concerning "déclassement" is critical to an understanding of Guéhenno, because it explains why culture - his central preoccupation, is such a problem for him. André Thérive draws attention to this when he states that: "(Guéhenno) prétend que la culture... agissait comme un poison sur son âme, et menaçait de tuer sa solidarité avec ses vrais semblables"⁽⁵³⁾. Guéhenno's principal difficulty is that he is unable to cope with the consequences of changing his social status. For the Figaro critic Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is therefore a reworking of L'Évangile éternel: "sa vie lui sert à écrire un livre qu'il (Guéhenno) a déjà écrit à propos de Michelet et qu'il écrira sans doute encore: un cahier des doléances d'un intellectuel sorti du peuple"⁽⁵⁴⁾.

The concern with which Guéhenno views his "déclassement" invites a comparison between himself and Paul Nizan, whose Antoine Bloyé, published in 1933, is a detailed exploration of this problem. Like the narrator of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, Antoine spends his childhood in the country and his problems only start when he moves with his parents to the town of Saint-Nazaire. In the urban environment both decide to better themselves through education, but W.D. Redfern believes that in Antoine Bloyé, "Nizan presents Antoine as launched on a path which he perhaps believes he has chosen for himself, but the path leads downward:

not a climb but a degradation"⁽⁵⁵⁾. Two scenes in particular present the problem of déclassement in a manner which evokes certain pages of Guéhenno's book. When Marcelle accuses Antoine of becoming a bourgeois: "tu quittes le monde où nous étions, tu vas devenir... un bourgeois"⁽⁵⁶⁾, her words echo those of Guéhenno's mother in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. Furthermore, the scene where Guéhenno experiences shame when he goes out into the streets to meet the workers leaving the factory gates, evokes the evening when Antoine picks up the body of an engine driver killed in an accident. Antoine is forced to ask himself: "lui, qui n'était pas l'ennemi de ces hommes, était-il donc complice de leurs ennemis?"⁽⁵⁷⁾. His conclusion that he is a traitor⁽⁵⁸⁾ is a factor which later leads him to commit suicide. In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno avoids the unambiguous conclusions of Antoine and this is why he believes that solutions exist through which he can overcome the problem of "déclassement".

The intensity with which Guéhenno experienced the guilt over his "déclassement" and the importance which he attaches to it in his book, means that it cannot be dismissed as a product of an over-sensitive conscience and his methods of dealing with this problem require detailed consideration. Guéhenno tries to overcome his guilt in several ways and with varying degrees of subtlety. At times he is tempted to resolve the problem by denying that he is "déclassé". This is particularly evident when he speaks of the poor in the first person plural: "la vie des pauvres est quelque chose d'humble (selon les gouvernements) ... Il semble que nous n'ayons point d'âme" (J.40. p.57). The

Figaro critic takes the view that "M. Guéhenno est avec une conscience de classe si résolue le Prolétarien avec un grand P que je crains de perdre mon temps en m'occupant de lui dans ce journal"⁽⁵⁹⁾. More usually however, Guéhenno admits that he is "déclassé", but claims fidelity to his origins: "Revenu à Paris, je me considérais sans modestie, dans ce château de papier (L'École Normale Supérieure) où la chance m'avait conduit, comme un délégué... des pauvres" (J.40.p.141). Nevertheless, because he "déclassé" Guéhenno cannot find his place in the real world and according to the Figaro critic prefers to live in the world of ideas: "Aucune réalité de l'ordre social ne prend place entre son coeur désolé et les chimères dont il se nourrit. Il appelle Europe un de ses rêves"⁽⁶⁰⁾. Guéhenno also tries to resolve the difference between himself as an intellectual and the masses, by referring back to the argument put forward in Conversion à l'humain concerning transference as a principle of communion among men. André Malraux points this out in his article for La Nouvelle Revue Française, when he says that "chacune de ces pages (du Journal) fait partie d'une action: montrer que "l'âme d'un pauvre homme, comme celle du plus grand artiste, peut contenir tout l'infini". Là est l'essentiel propos de Guéhenno"⁽⁶¹⁾. Guéhenno seeks to show that all men are similar and to this end he stresses how ordinary he is himself: "mon histoire manque de singularité... je ressemblais à tout le monde" (J.40.p.67). J.B. Séverac, reviewing the Journal for Le Populaire notes that: "il ne séparait pas l'idée d'une vie meilleure pour lui de celle d'une vie meilleure pour tous"⁽⁶²⁾, whilst Malraux believes that

Guéhenno has a universal aim: " la connaissance de l'homme" (63).

The purpose of Guéhenno's arguments is to show that he is like others and that others are like him. This is important, because if true it means that Guéhenno did not betray anyone by leaving the factory, as betrayal is only possible if people are so unlike that their individual interests are incompatible. Only in such circumstances can one person acting in his own interest of necessity "betray" another. Malraux is right to stress that for Guéhenno: "Il faut chercher en soi-même autre chose que soi-même pour pouvoir se regarder longtemps", and that "Guéhenno cherche une adhésion" (64). He finds it through transference, that is he sees all individuals as essentially similar to each other and sharing the same interests.

The problem of Guéhenno's guilt about "déclassement" is further complicated if his real biography is taken into account, especially the relatively affluent period of his early teens and if this is set against the selective account given in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. Thérive makes an apparent reference to this when he questions the reality of Guéhenno's assertion that culture is becoming a barrier between himself and the masses: "Je n'en crois rien. Il n'a jamais connu ce risque, né bourgeois" (65). This is incorrect, but certainly as a teenager Guéhenno was part of a petit-bourgeois family. His father became a commercial traveller and his mother the proprietor of a café, which later fell on hard times owing to the father's illness. A final point to note is that the contradictions of Guéhenno, an individualist who also feels guilty about his success, and his attempt to resolve these contradictions, have a marked effect on his style.

It is immediately apparent that Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is not a journal in the conventional sense, even though as the Figaro critic correctly notes: "(Guéhenno) y parle, cette fois, sans personne interposée... ce qu'il appelle journal n'est pas un journal. Ce sont des souvenirs"⁽⁶⁶⁾. This view is shared by René Lalou in Les Nouvelles Littéraires: "fort heureusement le livre n'a rien d'un journal minutieux. De son passé Guéhenno retient seulement ce qui a contribué à le former tel qu'il se trouve à quarante ans"⁽⁶⁷⁾. Gabriel Marcel also states that Journal d'un homme de 40 ans "n'est point du tout un journal mais... un bilan"⁽⁶⁸⁾. Malraux is even more emphatic: "Journal? Non. En rien. Ni mémoires, ni même confession"⁽⁶⁹⁾. A very important aspect of Guéhenno's work is raised by Thérive's questioning the title on the grounds that: "on y trouve tout autre chose qu'un carnet intime"⁽⁷⁰⁾. This lack of intimacy is deliberate on Guéhenno's part. He wishes to write "l'histoire de tous les gens de rien, de tous les hommes peut-être" (J.40.p.29). Consequently as Thérive points out: "il répète trois ou quatre fois au lecteur qu'il ressemble à tout le monde. N'ayant rien de nous dire de rare... il a horreur de l'anecdote"⁽⁷¹⁾. The reason for this is that Guéhenno does not wish to individualise his story as this would prevent him realising Michelet's aim of being "le moi-humanité"⁽⁷²⁾, which he set himself in L'Évangile éternel. The desire to speak for all and write a book raising general intellectual problems which would demonstrate his social concerns as well as his fidelity to the masses means that the normal journal format is not really appropriate, which is why Guéhenno states: "j'ai longtemps résisté au désir, au besoin que j'avais d'écrire ce journal" (J40.p.13).

Equally significant is his reply to Jean Paulhan's observation that there is very little about the École Normale Supérieure in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans: "(vous me demandez) pourquoi je n'ai pas davantage parlé sur l'histoire de l'E,N,?... (c'est) parce que ce ne m'a pas paru si important"⁽⁷³⁾. The real reason for Guéhenno's reticence about writing on his life at the École Normale is surely that studies there are hardly part of the life of the "homme de série" he presents himself as being⁽⁷⁴⁾. Guéhenno believes that "j'ai conscience d'appartenir à une espèce commune de l'humanité et cela m'aide à croire qu'en parlant de moi, je parlerai aussi des autres" (J.40.p.13). This however is only possible if the account of his life given in the Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is a selective one, which indeed it is. Nonetheless this selectivity does enable Guéhenno to give his story a significance which transcends his personal problems. In a private letter to him, Romain Rolland congratulates Guéhenno on his work and states that: "quelque scènes prennent un caractère général"⁽⁷⁵⁾.

Given the intentions of the author, Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is not only a non-journal, but also a non-journal with pages missing. J.B. Séverac notes that after Jaurès' speech, "il y a une lacune dans le récit que Jean Guéhenno nous fait de sa vie"⁽⁷⁶⁾. This is noted by Thérive⁽⁷⁷⁾, by Robert Brasillach and Albert Thibaudet. Brasillach is in fact content to quote Thibaudet's views: "Thibaudet l'a déjà fait remarquer... comment s'est effectué le passage de Fougères à l'É.N.S.? Ce journal est "un journal aux pages arrachées" - Ces pages auraient dû être consacrées aux amitiés de classe, à l'aide d'une bourgeoisie libérale"⁽⁷⁸⁾. He also accuses Guéhenno

of falsifying his war memoirs : "pourquoi arracher les pages au journal, quand on prétend être sincère. Qu'il déteste ou non sa jeunesse, là n'est pas la question. L'important est de ne pas déformer ses souvenirs pour être fidèle à un parti"(79).

The critics are right to note the gaps in Guéhenno's account of his life, but their explanations for them are purely speculative. What is undeniable is that by comparing Journal d'un homme de 40 ans with later autobiographies by Guéhenno himself, it becomes clear that he falsifies the account given in the former work by omitting to mention the affluent period in his life: "mon père était devenu voyageur de commerce. Nous nous trouvâmes dans une relative sécurité... Nous décidâmes de devenir riches. Ma mère avait pris un commerce, tenait un petit café" (C.V. p.94). Of particular importance is the failure to mention his studies at the Collège de Fougères paid for by his father and the reasons for working in the factory, which are only recalled in Changer la vie of 1961:

"Les études de mon petit collège ne devaient pas être bien fortes. La dernière année, mon père étant tombé malade, le principal me présenta à l'examen des bourses, et je n'y fus pas reçu... Je sus dès lors que je devrais quitter le collège et je fus... jusqu'à mon entrée à l'usine, dans un vrai désespoir" (C.V. p.115).

Guéhenno was a child destined for an academic career and his father's illness was the sole reason for his ever having set foot in a factory. In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans however, the lack of any reference to this creates the impression that Guéhenno was a working-class child destined for the factory, who only escaped this destiny by heroic personal efforts. In his effort to underline his ties with

the masses, Guéhenno forgets to mention that his personal contact with the factory was accidental as well as short-lived.

Nonetheless the fact that Guehenno manufactures a false persona for himself by falsifying his autobiography is only significant if Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is indeed a true autobiography. The question of what constitutes true autobiography is discussed at length in Philippe Lejeune's Le pacte autobiographique, where he defines it as: "un récit rétrospectif en prose qu'une personne réelle fait de sa propre existence, lorsqu'elle met l'accent sur sa vie individuelle, en particulier sur l'histoire de sa personnalité"⁽⁸⁰⁾. Lejeune understands autobiography as a pact between the author and the reader which is based on the assumption that the entire content of the autobiography is true to life⁽⁸¹⁾. Consequently: "l'autobiographie suppose qu'il y ait identité de nom entre l'auteur, le narrateur du récit et le personnage dont on parle"⁽⁸²⁾. Lejeune's viewpoint is shared by Georges May, who believes that: "ce qui empêche de confondre une autobiographie et un roman, ce ne sont pas les aspects concrets du texte... c'est... le fait que l'autobiographie affirme sa sincérité et son intention de dire la vérité"⁽⁸³⁾. The example which Lejeune gives of a true autobiography is Rousseau's Confessions, where "le pacte (autobiographique) figure dès le titre, il est développé dans le préambule, et confirmé tout au long du texte par l'emploi de "Rousseau" et de "Jean-Jacques""⁽⁸⁴⁾. Given the definition used by Lejeune and May, Journal d'un homme de 40 ans with its "missing pages" as well as its lack of full place names, cannot be accepted as a true autobiography. It is rather what Lejeune terms "un roman autobiographique"⁽⁸⁵⁾ and it is no accident that André Malraux

prefers to see it as a novel rather than as an autobiography:

"à plusieurs pages... Guéhenno s'achemine... vers le roman"⁽⁸⁶⁾.

He places Guéhenno's work in the mainstream of contemporary writing, because: "Je crois que le fait capital de notre littéraire, ces dernières années, a été la substitution d'un ton qui exprime une personne, à une "écriture" qui exprime un art"⁽⁸⁷⁾. Although all the events portrayed in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans are taken from the author's own life, his manipulation of them is so extensive that it is a mistake to limit the analysis of the work to the question of autobiography.

Because Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is not a straightforward personal autobiography but rather an attempt to present the life of an average person, it can be evaluated on different levels. Guéhenno himself in his introduction states that: "il me plairait que ce récit fût comme mitoyen entre ma vie et celle des autres, que ce journal fût quelquefois comme la méditation d'un Européen de quarante ans" (J.40.p.13). His use of autobiography as a basis for a biography of "everyman" is therefore a continuation of the method of Caliban parle. Guéhenno's peculiar autobiography can be seen as an archaic example of romantic and moralistic writing and this is the view taken by Thérive: "Guéhenno, qu'on n'accusera pas de manquer de romantisme a... une vocation de moraliste... (et) il a une tendance un peu archaïque... à tourner les idées en métaphores"⁽⁸⁸⁾. Micheline Tison-Braun, in her La crise de l'humanisme, also notes in this context Guéhenno's love of archaic characters and his view of socialism as a dream of poets and intellectuals⁽⁸⁹⁾. An alternative analysis is put forward by Malraux: "J'insiste sur cet élément

d'expérience, à mes yeux l'élément positif de ce livre qu'on ne comprendrait pas si on le lisait en attendant de lui philosophie, psychologie ou souvenirs. De tels livres valent par le ton"⁽⁹⁰⁾.

The views of both Thérive and Malraux are important, because taken together they help to situate Guéhenno within a certain literary tradition. The belief that the individual is the only possible subject of philosophical writing and the dated mode of expression make Guéhenno a successor to the French tradition of humanist writing, which dates back to Montaigne and Rousseau. Guéhenno was always prepared to acknowledge his heritage and it is no accident that he spent the Occupation working on a major biography of Rousseau.

Malraux's emphasis on the similarity between the style as well as the aim of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans and that of a novel is shared by Gabriel Marcel, who makes a comparison of Guéhenno's book with Louis Guilloux's La maison du peuple, published in 1927: "le milieu est presque... le même"⁽⁹¹⁾. The comparison is particularly appropriate, as Guilloux's book is undoubtedly a major influence on Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, since Guéhenno was deeply involved in its publication. Guilloux initially sent La maison du peuple to Daniel Halévy in March 1927 and Halévy passed it on to Guéhenno for approval⁽⁹²⁾. Guéhenno's reaction to it was enthusiastic: "(c'est entendre) quelqu'un témoigner pour moi"⁽⁹³⁾. According to Mary Jean Matthews Green he quite clearly saw his own life in Guilloux's work⁽⁹⁴⁾. The parallels between La maison du peuple and Journal d'un homme de 40 ans are so numerous and wide ranging, that they suggest that Guéhenno used Guilloux's earlier work as a model for his book. Both books deal with childhood, are

written in the first person and are narrated from a child's perspective. Moreover, although La maison du peuple is based on the author's autobiography it has the wider aim of seeking to portray the general condition of man⁽⁹⁵⁾, which is also the aim of Guéhenno's work.

Guilloux's characters are individualised, but Albert Camus believes that they also have a representative function: "(Guilloux) n'utilise la misère de tous les jours que pour mieux éclairer la douleur du monde. Il pousse ses personnages jusqu'au type universel"⁽⁹⁶⁾. This is why Guilloux is reluctant to mention Saint-Brieuc in his novel as his aim is to present a class rather than himself. This same insistence on the general aspects of an individual story is also present in Guéhenno and explains his own reluctance to mention Fougères by its full name. A further parallel between La maison du peuple and Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is provided by the portrayal of the parents in both books. There is a strong father-mother opposition in Guilloux's book as there is in Guéhenno's. Both fathers are cobblers and both are militants who encourage their customers to join trade unions⁽⁹⁷⁾. There is however a price to pay for this activity: the Guilloux business is boycotted by the bourgeoisie with near-fatal results⁽⁹⁸⁾. Fortunately the father's idealism is balanced by the mother's practical sense. Faced with the boycott she goes out to the rich in search of business and thereby enables the family to survive. There is a clear analogy here with the attitude displayed by Guéhenno's mother during the strike which nearly destroyed her family and it is the women's ability to transcend adverse circumstances, which makes it possible

for their husbands to retain their idealism. Guilloux's father does not despair when Fabert, the socialist leader, loses his job and is obliged to leave town: "on ne peut pas empêcher les idées de marcher"⁽⁹⁹⁾. Guéhenno's father reacts in a similar manner: "étions-nous donc des chiens pour ne penser qu'à notre pâtée" (J.40. p.71). Bearing in mind the thematic as well as the stylistic parallels between the works of Guéhenno and Guilloux it is important to note that the political ideology which both these authors serve is the same. Their common goal is Jaurèsian socialism and this is made clear by the presence of Jaurès as a symbol of hope and an inspiration, in both books. In La maison du peuple he is present in spirit at a meeting of the "section socialiste" where he is praised by members, who find confidence in themselves: "nous ne ferions rien que par nous-mêmes"⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. In Guéhenno's book Jaurès is present in person intervening directly in the strike of 1906-1907. Finally there is the question of the presentation of war. Although this is a problem which is only raised by the second part of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans it is worth remembering that in the ending of La maison du peuple Guéhenno found the view that war was synonymous with the destruction of socialist hopes for a better future⁽¹⁰¹⁾. There seems little doubt that in Guilloux's book Guéhenno found a literary model for his own work, which appealed to him because of its ideology, its themes and its artistic format.

In writing his evocation of working-class life Guéhenno placed himself within a tradition of working-class reminiscence created in the 1920s by his friends Guilloux and Eugène Dabit. Dabit's

Hôtel du Nord of 1929 is, like La maison du peuple, an important model for Journal d'un homme de 40 ans because it is likewise an autobiographical work⁽¹⁰²⁾ set in a working-class milieu and it is written by a man whom Guéhenno greatly admired⁽¹⁰³⁾. Nonetheless it is a somewhat different work, because in Hôtel du Nord Dabit gives the type of intimate portrayal of individual lives, which Guéhenno strives to avoid. Dabit's format of chapters devoted to each hotel resident focusses the reader's attention on individuals and their private problems, hence there is a frank treatment of sex and the narrative is full of the anecdotes Guéhenno hates. A girl is once found drowned in the canal⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ and the proprietor's wife Mme. Lecouvreur is called upon to help one resident, M. Adrien, dress up as a woman⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. Nevertheless Dabit's more intimate view of working-class life succeeds in describing the "existences machinales" of the residents⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. Moreover it is legitimate to argue that by stripping his narrative of the intimate adventures and anecdotes which every life is full of in an attempt to show only that which all men have in common, Guéhenno is ironically making his story rather singular as well as less entertaining. This pitfall is wisely avoided by Dabit. Although his aesthetic approach to presenting working-class life differs to that of Guilloux and Guéhenno his treatment of political aspirations does not, as the political struggle is integrated into the narrative to show its reality and relevance to the workers. A revolutionary, Bénitaud comes to live in the hotel bringing with him pictures of Lenin and Jaurès. May-day, traditionally a time when the masses demonstrate, serves to expose the divisions in society. A heavy police presence throughout the day does not prevent a march by the

unemployed and in fact contributes to the ensuing riot⁽¹⁰⁷⁾.

In comparing Journal d'un homme de 40 ans with the work of Guilloux and Dabit it becomes apparent that Guéhenno's work needs to be understood in the context of a tradition of autobiographical writing evoking working-class life created by writers who originated from that class and remained politically committed to it. As a genre, the works created by Guilloux, Dabit and Guéhenno differ markedly from the earlier naturalistic accounts of working-class life because they are based not on contemporary studies of working-class conditions, but on the personal recollections of the authors. As a result the use of an autobiographical format is an appropriate stylistic choice. Although their works are autobiographical, all three writers aim to generalise their personal experiences and because of this their works display many of the features of the novel. At the same time this tendency towards generalisation, particularly in the cases of Guilloux and Guéhenno, has the effect of distinguishing their work from the genre of provincial memoirs whose political conservatism is unacceptable to them.

The second part of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans contains Guéhenno's fullest account of his views on war and is acknowledged by some to be the best part of the book⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. Although critical attention focusses mainly on the work as a statement of pacifism it is in fact a very personal account of Guéhenno's experiences of the First World War and a protest against it. The critics' reaction is however understandable, given that the book was published in 1934, that is at a time when armed conflict at home as well as abroad and attitudes towards it, become a matter

of urgency. The troubles in Manchuria in 1931⁽¹⁰⁹⁾, the coming to power of Hitler in Germany in 1933 and the earlier financial problems which faced the Herriot government in 1932⁽¹¹⁰⁾, did little to inspire optimism for the future. More importantly, however, the riots of the 6th February 1934 which took place after several months of governmental instability⁽¹¹¹⁾, revealed the seriousness of the threat to peace at home.

In an attempt to understand the causes of 1914 Guéhenno extends his account of war in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans to include a critique of pre-1914 French society. This takes the form of a selection of his own earliest memories. The description of the visit of the President of the Republic to Guéhenno's home town consequently takes on a symbolic function. The message of the President is shown to be profoundly conservative, but afterwards: "on applaudit si fort que tous les oiseaux qui avaient accompagné... les périodes oratoires quittèrent d'un seul vol le jardin" (J.40.p.46). This scene serves to demonstrate the passive attitude of the masses and their capacity to assimilate propaganda which goes beyond mere acquiescence. Referring to the war, Guéhenno realises that "rien de tout ce qui a été n'eût été possible si, pendant des années, nous n'avions subi certaine préparation" (J.40. p.83). Furthermore: "Sans le savoir seulement, nous étions pris dans ce système de violence et d'hypocrisie: c'est ce que les gouvernements appellent compter sur notre patriotisme" (J.40. p.94). Nationalist attitudes became so widely accepted that "il n'y avait pas d'Europe quand nous étions enfants" (J.40. p.81). The power of official propaganda is most effectively shown when Guéhenno describes its influence on his childhood games: "nous avons beaucoup joué aux Anglais et aux

Boërs... On n'était Anglais que par force. Déjà nous prétendions n'être que du parti des justes" (J.40. p.88).

In the account of his personal experience of war Guéhenno is frank, honest and precise. René Lalou rightly notes that "pour évoquer ces années, Guéhenno rapporte des expériences précises, indiscutables"⁽¹¹²⁾. He admits he felt joy at the prospect of leaving for the front and that he succumbed to the general illusions⁽¹¹³⁾. Nonetheless his admission is qualified by the description of the march to the trenches, which is like a descent into the underworld:

"nous montâmes aux tranchées... L'effort rendait impossible toute pensée... On ne savait pas, auparavant, que la nuit pût être si noire..., j'entrai dans la tranchée... J'entrevis autour de nous un bois mutilé... Enfin je me trouvai devant un trou étroit et profond, incliné, creusé comme une tombe" (J.40. pp.154-155).

Such a sudden change of emphasis is surprising and can be interpreted as a case of the author manipulating the facts after the event, but in the light of further information supplied by Guéhenno it is clear that even before he left the officer-training camp, he had already experienced his first doubts about the war. The mention of the doubts he had in Paris⁽¹¹⁴⁾ and later after an illness at the training camp⁽¹¹⁵⁾ does not however change the fact that his initial attitude to war as presented in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is terribly confused: "un jour je voulais partir. Le lendemain, je ne le voulais plus" (J.40. p.176). He claims that he was still prepared to die for an idea: "car on veut bien mourir, comme un homme, pour une idée qui vaut plus que soi-même, mais on ne pouvait

vouloir mourir... dans cet espèce de chaos mécanique" (J.40. pp.179-180). Such an attitude is not unique to Guéhenno, as soldiers in the trenches felt frustrated and wanted body fighting⁽¹¹⁶⁾. The theme of mechanised war is raised by his friend Jean Giono, in Le Poids du Ciel of 1938, which is "a nightmare vision of ultra-mechanised war"⁽¹¹⁷⁾. Giono emphasises the totalitarian nature of war, so war, not Germany is presented as the real enemy⁽¹¹⁸⁾. He also published "Refus d'obéissance" in Guéhenno's Europe in November 1934, that is, at the time of the publication of Guéhenno's book. At this stage the views of both men were very similar, hence Guéhenno's reaction to Giono's article expressed in a letter to him: "je viens de lire ces pages sur la guerre que tu m'as envoyées et je sens entre nous une si profonde fraternité"⁽¹¹⁹⁾. Their later disagreements did not prevent Guéhenno interceding on Giono's behalf- albeit grudgingly, when he was arrested for his pacifist activities. Writing to François Mauriac, Guéhenno states: "au moins faudrait-il obtenir qu'il ne soit pas au droit commun"⁽¹²⁰⁾. A final point to note is Giono's article in L'Oeuvre of September 1938 where he says that a living coward is preferable to a dead hero⁽¹²¹⁾. This refusal to consider cowardice as dishonourable is also shared by Guéhenno: "j'ai été lâche autant que les autres... une pensée plus nette, un coeur plus ferme auraient refusé de servir. C'était alors la mort certaine. Voilà bien ce que je ne voulais pas" (J.40. p.163). Cowardice is therefore a logical attitude for an individual to adopt and it is the only method of self-preservation: "si (des survivants) vivent encore, c'est qu'ils ont choisi de vivre" (J.40. p.162). In his latter period of active service

Guéhenno is a coward because he wants to live and no longer believes in the war.

In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno claims that when news reached him of his friend A.D.'s death in Serbia⁽¹²²⁾, "les choses m'apparaissaient enfin comme elles étaient" (J.40. p.181). He is honest about his past and admits that as an officer he still made patriotic speeches to his men⁽¹²³⁾, but he regrets not showing greater courage in this matter: "j'ai conscience aujourd'hui que si j'avais eu plus de courage... ou j'aurais refusé de parler, ou j'aurais plus franchement mis ces hommes... devant la vérité" (J.40. p.190). Nonetheless this moral dilemma is shown to be short-lived. Soon after arriving at the front he is injured, so ironically he ends his direct participation in the war as a hero and martyr to the cause. Mindful of this irony, Guéhenno describes being hit in an almost off-hand manner: "soudain je sentis à la tête comme un coup de fouet. J'eus le temps de marmonner quelques paroles d'adieu" (J.40. p.195). It is easy to criticise Guéhenno for being ambivalent in his attitude to war whilst he was directly involved in it, but this ambivalence is by no means unexpected in a participant. War does have its recompenses, the most important being solidarity: "mieux que personne et mieux, qu'en aucun temps peut-être, nous avons connu des solidarités, senti que nous n'étions qu'un même sang" (J.40. p.199). This is a fact which Guéhenno drew attention to earlier in L'Évangile éternel and Caliban parle⁽¹²⁴⁾, where he related it to the "sens humain" and the argument that all men are alike. René Lalou sees this as an important aspect of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans: "en lisant Guéhenno, des milliers d'êtres éprouveront

... une impression de solidarité humaine dans la communauté des épreuves"⁽¹²⁵⁾. The attitude to war which Guéhenno displays in 1915 prefigures the literature of 1916-1917, particularly the theme of the purposeless war⁽¹²⁶⁾, but this must however be qualified by the paradox of Verdun forging collective ties⁽¹²⁷⁾. Lalou's emphasis on Guéhenno's acknowledgement of the solidarity to be found in combat raises a problem which is also present in the work of Roland Dorgelès and Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. Dorgelès' Les croix de bois, like Journal d'un homme de 40 ans a condemnation of war, ends with an admission that "c'était le bon temps... Oui malgré tout, c'était le bon temps... On a bien ri au repos entre deux marches accablantes, on a bien ri..."⁽¹²⁸⁾. When Saint-Exupéry refers to the First World War at the end of Terre des hommes, he also presents it as a time of heightened solidarity: "le goût du pain rompu entre camarades nous a fait accepter les valeurs de guerre"⁽¹²⁹⁾.

Because Journal d'un homme de 40 ans aims to present war from the perspective of a participant, this book is not a statement of pacifist ideology. As a result when Guéhenno is no longer talking about the First World War from an individual standpoint but tries to make general comments, his message seems confused and not well thought out, despite the twenty years that have elapsed since 1914. He claims this is inevitable as "l'événement était hors de proportions même avec la plus grande force de notre esprit... (c'était) une catastrophe... mécanique qu'il était la preuve même que les hommes avaient perdu le contrôle du monde" (J.40. pp.178-179). Nonetheless he attempts a crude Marxist analysis of the war in terms of the class

system. He claims the poor face the greatest risks in war:

"je tiens que la pauvreté conduit bien mieux à la tranchée et à une mort héroïque qu'un seul des millions de Rotschild" (J.40.p.56).

This analysis degenerates into moral outrage: "la guerre fut là tout d'un coup, parce qu'un archiduc... dont personne ne sait plus le nom, avait été tué" (J.40. p.145). Consequently: "je dirai donc que j'ai conscience que mes amis sont morts pour rien. Pour rien" (J.40. p.208). Guéhenno sees the armistice in purely economic terms: "il vint un temps enfin où l'argent, le fer, le pétrole, les hommes... vinrent à bout du manque d'argent, de fer..." (J.40. p.219). His views are therefore close to those put forward in Henri Barbusse's Le Feu. Barbusse stresses the class aspect of war, showing it to be a capitalist conflict⁽¹³⁰⁾ which for that very reason makes it irrelevant to most men, who see little purpose in it⁽¹³¹⁾. Barbusse also underlines the absurdity of the human condition in war⁽¹³²⁾, which is an observation made by Guéhenno:

"C'était la fleur des hommes de la terre et son espoir (qui mourait). Il n'y avait point ici d'estropiés, de malades, de boiteux... N'était venu encore ici que ce qu'en tout pays... les mères avaient conçu de mieux" (J.40. p.200).

The critique of war in terms of class evidently fails to satisfy Guéhenno since he also reluctantly admits that the masses' participation in war was freely given. He makes perceptive comments on the psychology of war which show he shares Romain Rolland's view that the potential for war exists in all men⁽¹³³⁾. Guéhenno remembers how honour obliged him to hold a poor position: "à quarante mètres en arrière, sur la colline, la position eût été

plus sûre. Mais l'ordre et l'honneur... exigeaient qu'on demeurât là, dans ce cloaque" (J.40. p.193). He therefore concludes that the concept of honour was the real reason for the war continuing: "nous songions à notre départ proche... Non pour la France, non pour la justice. Mais pour la jeunesse et pour l'honneur. Les jeunes morts appelaient les jeunes vivants" (J.40. p.182).

Critics who choose to look at Journal d'un homme de 40 ans solely in terms of the pacifist "message" which it contains are naturally scathing about it, as they do not appreciate that the book is primarily a soldier's account. André Thérive is not impressed by the recollections of war⁽¹³⁴⁾ and demolishes Guéhenno's argument that the masses were the sole victims of a war begun by the ruling classes: "Guéhenno ne peut vraiment soutenir cette thèse car... la bourgeoisie... avait tout à perdre... les professions libérales ont été encore mieux massacrées que les travailleurs manuels"⁽¹³⁵⁾. Thérive's criticism parallels that of Alain who also rejects the view that wars originate for economic reasons. In Alain's opinion passions are the root causes⁽¹³⁶⁾. Robert Kemp views Guéhenno's argument that the First World War was a war of the rich with astonishment: "sérieusement M. Guéhenno croit-il encore que la guerre de 1914 n'était qu'une guerre de riches?"⁽¹³⁷⁾, while Gabriel Marcel dismisses Guéhenno's arguments on the matter as wholly untenable. In Marcel's opinion, the pages which Guéhenno devotes to war: "trahissent une incapacité presque malade de penser avec objectivité - et peut-être faudrait-il dire de penser tout court"⁽¹³⁸⁾. Marcel follows Guéhenno's

argument and demonstrates it to be inadequate. If Guéhenno is asked the question:

"quoi faire le 2 août 1914. Que répondrait-il? Que chaque Français aurait dû se muer en objecteur de conscience, ce qui eût valu à notre pays l'écrasement immédiat?... M. Guéhenno protestera: chaque Allemand aurait dû en faire autant... Comment ne pas voir que tout cela revient à déplorer que les hommes soient ce qu'ils sont?"⁽¹³⁵⁾.

Given what he considers to be the demonstrable naivety of Guéhenno's views, Marcel's conclusion is severe but logical: "dans la mesure où Journal d'un homme de 40 ans se présente comme un message ou comme un verdict on ne peut que le récuser presque intégralement"⁽¹⁴⁰⁾.

It is clear that in as far as the book contains a message - and it is intended to be a warning to youth, it is a very personal message of pacifism very closely tied to the realities of 1914: "l'exemple de nos lâches et vaines misères servira-t-il ceux qui nous suivent?... Je leur souhaite... plus de chance" (J.40.p.16). Guéhenno is not alone in using an account of 1914 in this didactic sense as his friend Roger Martin du Gard has a similar purpose in the last volumes of Les Thibault, published two years after Guéhenno's work. In the volume entitled L'Été 1914 the character Jacques appreciates the absurdity of the justifications for war when he realises that: "le sort de millions d'insouciants est aux mains de quelques hommes choisis presque au hasard et auxquels, absurdement, les peuples confient le soin de leur sécurité"⁽¹⁴¹⁾. This is why in a desperate bid to warn the masses he writes his "Manifeste", beginning with the words: "Français, Allemands. Tous frères! Vous êtes pareils! Et pareillement victimes"⁽¹⁴²⁾.

Guéhenno's statement that war is totalitarian from the individual's point of view is the best evidence for the proposition that pacifism for him is above all a personal matter: "nous étions... comme un condamné que dans sa prison on conduit de chambre en chambre jusqu'à celle enfin où il doit et peut mourir" (J.40. p.147). Although Guéhenno's pacifism is essentially a reaction to a personal experience it has affinities with the integral pacifism of Romain Rolland, at the time of his interest in Gandhi: "nous savons qu'il n'est pas de "justes guerres"" (J.40. p.164). Such a statement can also however be taken as proof of Guéhenno's individualist attitude to war, because clearly war is always unjust from an individual point of view. War serves to illustrate the point that what makes good sense for society as a whole does not necessarily make good sense for its individual members. Moreover because Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is a presentation of the First World War from an individual viewpoint it fails to take into account the various political forms of pacifism current in the 1930s. No attempt is made to consider pacifism as a tactic despite the long tradition behind this view. In 1910 Jean Jaurès condemned offensive war, but at the same time he wanted to arm the whole nation, thereby assuring national defence whilst limiting the power of the regular army⁽¹⁴³⁾. Jaurès therefore accepted that pacifism was a tactic and that circumstances might justify war. The anti-war motions discussed at the meeting of the Second International in Stuttgart in 1907 and defended by Hervé, Jaurès and Vaillant, proposed a general strike as well as a general insurrection as a response to war⁽¹⁴⁴⁾, but it must be remembered that the background to this was the assumption that workers in all

the countries involved in the conflict would take similar action.

The problems presented by Journal d'un homme de 40 ans with respect to pacifist doctrine are easily seen if the work is compared with André Chamson's Roux le bandit, which, unlike the Journal, is very much a "roman à thèse". This important text by Guéhenno's long-standing friend and later his co-director on Vendredi predates his own work by nine years, but it offers a more coherent system of thought, because pacifism is presented as a logical social philosophy rather than as a personal response to adverse circumstances. Like the Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, Roux le bandit is the story of an individual and there is the same emphasis on the fact that the central character is representative of all humanity: "c'était un homme comme tout le monde"⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. As W. Lough states in his introduction: "Roux is the story of a community rather than of an individual"⁽¹⁴⁶⁾. What distinguishes Roux from Guéhenno however, is that Roux is opposed to war for moral and religious reasons which society as a whole claims to respect. In particular Roux refuses to break the commandment "thou shalt not kill" : "je ne veux pas que les hommes se tuent"⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. Because of this, Roux's conscience is clear on an individual as well as on a social level and his example makes others uneasy, owing to the fact that they know they have broken a religious as well as a social law, by supporting the war. The narrator Finiels admits that when he learnt that Roux rejected war out of religious convictions he could no longer be angry⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. Roux remains faithful to the true aspirations of

the peasant community despite the fact that in the early days of the war this community is "enragée contre Roux"⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. Roux speaks for the peasants on the day of mobilisation⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ when he states his opposition to war, which is grounded in the teachings of their common Protestant religion. Consequently although at that time his message is rejected by the peasants he soon becomes a saintly figure in their eyes, Le Pagès, the first person to speak to Roux after the latter's escape into the mountains, tells the other peasants: "c'est un homme de Dieu... ses paroles... ressemblaient à des passages (de l'Évangile)"⁽¹⁵¹⁾. The welcome which Roux finds among the peasants in the last years of the war proves that his refusal of conscription conforms to their wishes and that they feel guilt at having once condemned him.

It is however not only Roux's actual protest which conforms to the moral and social law. The form which it takes is equally appropriate to a peasant. When he learns about Pastor Aguilhon, who went to war but refused to use a gun, Roux tells Finiels that a pastor must follow his flock, but that a christian should not follow an erring crowd and moreover he argues that, being a simple peasant with no status, if he had gone to war, his will not to fight would not have been respected: "vis-à-vis le gouvernement, un paysan doit faire tout ce qu'on lui demande - ou bien refuser complètement de le faire"⁽¹⁵²⁾. A peasant has no option but to become a fugitive like Roux, although the ideal would be to stay and look after the farm. This is in fact what Roux finally attempts and when Finiels sees Roux helping with the harvest he is overjoyed to see him working usefully: "Le Roux a repris son ancien métier"⁽¹⁵³⁾.

It is ironic therefore that this attempt to live a useful as well as a moral life is Roux's undoing: "c'est bien ce qui l'a perdu"⁽¹⁵⁴⁾. When Roux is caught, it is not as a fugitive but as a peasant going about his normal business helping another peasant. The scene has symbolic meaning because it shows that Roux is punished for fulfilling the destiny of a peasant by people who stand outside his community. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, war is shown to be futile as well as immoral, because it changes nothing and no good comes of it⁽¹⁵⁵⁾. In this respect Guéhenno, whose general views on war are otherwise somewhat superficial, arrives at the same conclusion as Chamson when he recalls how easily former soldiers readjusted to civilian life in bourgeois society: "un peu d'argent dans sa poche, un ruban à sa boutonnière, chacun de nous eut bientôt l'air d'un sous-officier retraité..." (J.40. p.224). In general terms however, Roux le bandit differs from Journal d'un homme de 40 ans because it presents pacifism as a legitimate social attitude rather than as an expression of individual revolt. It is nevertheless ironic that whereas Guéhenno, whose general viewpoint is confused, remains faithful to his pacifist views throughout his life Chamson, whose pacifism is more rigorous but purely intellectual, abandons it entirely during the Occupation.

Guéhenno's conclusion that war changes nothing makes the consideration of the ending to Journal d'un homme de 40 ans a matter of some importance. The ending is quite consciously pessimistic and in Guéhenno's view perhaps even "trop noir"⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. He despairs of idealism, confronted by the materialistic money-centred society which appears to satisfy everyone after the war:

"qu'advenait-il de tous mes rêves?... La grande masse a faim et n'aspire qu'à la sécurité. Elle ne veut que manger tous les jours" (J.40. p.239). Furthermore: "dans nos sociétés fondées sur le seul argent (des) âmes basses donnent le ton, déterminent les usages et les mœurs" (J.40. pp.224-225). There is no desire to change the principles of the old bourgeois order as the economic boom satisfies all: "pas un gueux qui n'espérât devenir riche" (J.40. p.236). Guéhenno's analysis of the values of society in the 1920s is supported by other commentators on the period. Paul Louis sees the 1920s as a period of prosperity with constantly rising wages and no unemployment⁽¹⁵⁷⁾, whilst Micheline Tison-Braun notes the shallow materialistic aspirations of the people. She believes that the jazz age is characterised by a passion for sport and entertainment⁽¹⁵⁸⁾, and that a generation-gap appears as older people notice the desire for a fast life as well as new inventions among the young⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. The novels of Paul Morand are a mirror of this society: speculators make and lose fortunes in a day, inhibitions are gone, but there is a sadness underneath this false and shallow vitality⁽¹⁶⁰⁾. Guéhenno himself remains obsessed with memories of the past. He is outraged by what he sees as the abuse of the dead by the government, in the creation of the tomb of the unknown soldier:

"c'est lui (le soldat inconnu) qui garantit la vertu de nos maîtres, la fidélité de leur souvenir, leur dévouement au bien public... ils ont fait de ce pauvre mort le grand ordonnateur de la cérémonie sociale, telle qu'ils veulent qu'elle soit réglée, l'idole qui dit toujours oui" (J.40. pp.226-227).

Because the dead are silent words can be spoken in their name

with impunity: "il faut que vous (les morts) soyez les plus fermes soutiens de la société des vivants. Il n'importe au vieillard ce que fut le débat de votre âme effarée" (J.40. p.203). The falsification of the facts concerning the morale of the dying soldiers obviously poses the danger that people might forget the horrors of war and be persuaded to fight once again. This possibility of another conflict is what makes the ending of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans so pessimistic: "la guerre, nous dit-on, de nouveau monte autour de nous" (J.40. p.249). Guéhenno emphasises the relevance of the memories of 1914-1918 to the contemporary situation by breaking up the narrative of earlier events with news items of 1933, which show tension on a world-wide scale:

"aujourd'hui, 6 février 1933, les obsèques de la duchesse d'Uzès... Un collégien nazi, à Strassfurt a tué le maire de la ville... Les Japonais marchent sur le Jehol... Je vois ces foules qui, cet après-midi, ont défilé à Berlin devant le bel Adolphe" (J.40. pp.165-166).

It is clear that Guéhenno is a misfit in post-1918 society. It is with difficulty that he resists the temptation to withdraw from the world:

"je ne me réfugierai pas, dégoûté, dans quelque chimérique arrière-monde... Il faut guérir les maux qu'on peut guérir... (mais) j'ai été constamment de ceux qui ont refusé ce monde honteux dans lequel nous avons dû vivre" (J.40. p.253).

The truth, however, is that it is not Guéhenno who rejects the world, but the world which rejects him. He recalls a post-war visit to a café with another survivor: "le patron nous présenta à une tablée de jeunes camarades... Quelques-uns firent un "ah!", puis retournèrent

à leurs cartes... on nous laissa à nous-mêmes" (J.40. pp. 232-233).

There is very little hope in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, but what hope does exist is provided by the Russian Revolution which Guéhenno presents as an inspiration: "c'est sa lueur qui depuis vingt ans nous aide à vivre" (J.40. p.241). As a symbol of hope the Russian Revolution fulfills the same function as it does in Louis Guilloux's Le Sang Noir of 1935⁽¹⁶¹⁾. When in Le Sang Noir a riot takes place at the Railway Station there are cries of "faudrait qu'on fasse comme les Russes"⁽¹⁶²⁾ and "vivre la Russie"⁽¹⁶³⁾, but these are expressions of dissatisfaction with war rather than of a will for revolution⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. Likewise in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno presents the Russian Revolution as little more than a symbol in France: "nous voyons se perdre et se noyer dans les marais d'Occident les étincelles que le vent nous apporte de cet incendie" (J.40. p.242). The view of Moscow as a model which France failed to imitate is in the opinion of Ilya Ehrenbourg the essence of Guéhenno's attitude towards Russia⁽¹⁶⁵⁾. Since in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno admits that he spent the latter part of the war as an administrator of an École de rééducation des soldats aveugles situated on the outskirts of Tours⁽¹⁶⁶⁾, he had little opportunity to notice the profound effect of the October Revolution on French workers⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. The real hope of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is spiritual improvement rather than political change:

"il est partout... dans les usines... dans les écoles, des hommes qui... n'espèrent pas de miracles... mais ils comptent sur toute leur raison. Ils ne veulent tricher, jamais, et cette honnêteté est le moyen même de leur victoire... l'avenir, j'en suis sûr, leur appartient" (J.40. pp.256-257).

J.B. Séverac also shares this view: "ces pages se terminent tout de même par des paroles d'espoir... espoir dans le salut de l'humanité par la Révolution des justes et de nobles contre les autres"(168). He uses the term "Révolution" in the spiritual sense in which it is understood by Guéhenno and quotes the latter's statement of faith in reason: "ces temps sont durs pour la raison sans doute, mais tout s'accomplira, à force de probité" (J.40. p.257).

Of all the works which Guéhenno published in the inter-war years Journal d'un homme de 40 ans was perhaps the one which he most wished to see in print. It is surely no accident that the seventh chapter of this work, "La jeunesse morte", is also the title of his first unpublished book on the war. It was therefore with considerable satisfaction that he greeted the critical response which his work attracted, as it gave him confidence in his ability to write. In a letter to his friend Jean Giono of April 1935 he is full of optimism for the future: "peut-être vais-je essayer à faire une pièce... (pour) le Journal... la presse est très abondante"(169). In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno once again reaffirms his individualism restating the views of "Patrie" and "Révolution" developed earlier in L'Évangile éternel and Caliban parle. Nevertheless in his latest work he finds for the first time a style to suit his temperament and his philosophical preoccupations. Guéhenno's choice of autobiography is well suited

to his view of the world, but his is not a self-indulgent use of the genre because he is plagued by the problem of "déclassement". The fear of betraying his social origins explains why culture was presented as such a major difficulty in Caliban parle and it also accounts for his desire to generalise his story, by fictionalising it where necessary. Guéhenno's Journal d'un homme de 40 ans can therefore be seen as part of a movement in the literary presentation of working-class life, which draws heavily on the authors' personal recollections and which was begun by Guéhenno's friends Dabit and Guilloux. Of the works produced by these authors, the latter's La maison du peuple is of particular importance as a model for Guéhenno's autobiography.

As well as an evocation of working-class childhood Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is also Guéhenno's first comprehensive account of 1914-1918 and of war in general, published at a time when he was becoming increasingly involved in the pacifist cause. His membership of the pacifist Front organisations as well as the articles which he was shortly to write for Europe and Vendredi were soon to make him a major spokesman of the pacifist Left. In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, however, far from tackling the problems of pacifism from an ideological viewpoint Guéhenno prefers to give his readers a very personal account of his wartime experiences. The pacifism of his latest book is therefore an expression of personal protest, which is why the book fails to satisfy those who look to it for a rigorous analysis of war. Nevertheless there is no doubt that Guéhenno's purpose is to warn the youth of 1934 of the dangers of war by drawing parallels between the contemporary situation and the pre-1914 period.

Although he is admittedly pessimistic about the future, he believes that hope does exist and he seeks it in the Russian Revolution. The Soviet question, the final major problem of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is perhaps the most difficult to evaluate. The pro-Soviet ending of the book appears strange, given that Guéhenno had been publically opposed to bolshevism since the 1920 s - a fact to which Caliban parle bears witness. Nonetheless it must be realised that like Guilloux in Le Sang Noir, Guéhenno uses the Soviet Union in a non-political manner. His is primarily a poetic invocation of the Soviets, who are presented as a symbol of hope and an alternative to the stagnant bourgeois society. The problem of the view of the Soviet Union in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans is however further complicated by Guéhenno's preface to the Soviet edition of his work of February 1936, the "Chant de confiance en la Russie". Its chief characteristic is a sudden and, in the light of known biographical facts, incomprehensible change of emphasis from everything that Guéhenno had previously written. The enthusiastic praise of Soviet communism is difficult to understand, given that he had just left Europe⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ on the issue of communist attempts to influence the review and that he was soon to write a major article condemning the Moscow trials⁽¹⁷¹⁾. The emphasis placed on the U.S.S.R. in the "Chant de confiance en la Russie" is out of all proportion to the actual references made to it in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. The image of the U.S.S.R. in the preface is of a Promised Land where "les esprits pouvaient aller ... à la limite du bien"⁽¹⁷²⁾. This is "ma Russie... terre de la tendresse humaine"⁽¹⁷³⁾. Nevertheless the most controversial aspects of the preface are Guéhenno's condemnation of the French

"peur du sang"⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ and his praise of Russia for correctly concluding the war: "vous avez fait la Révolution"⁽¹⁷⁵⁾. This implies that he supports violence in the pursuit of revolutionary aims, but it is a view which is utterly incompatible with Guéhenno's lifelong stated position on this matter. Consequently the "Chant de confiance en la Russie" has to be seen as standing outside the main body of his work. As such it can be interpreted as a product of the euphoria generated by the Front Populaire in 1936, or alternatively it may be connected with Guéhenno's planned visit to the U.S.S.R. in that year⁽¹⁷⁶⁾.

With the single exception of the Soviet question however, the ideas expressed in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans especially with regard to war, poverty and autobiography, represent the mature viewpoint of Guéhenno and as such are subsequently restated in his later books, particularly in Journal d'une Révolution, La Foi difficile, Changer la vie, Ce que je crois, La Mort des autres and Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs. These same ideas are also central to Guéhenno's work throughout the 1930 s, when he was editor of Europe.

Footnotes to Chapter Four

1. This is stated by Guéhenno in F.D. p.32.
2. Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 2nd August 1931. In Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.170.
3. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 24th May 1933. In Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.271.
4. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 9th September 1934. In Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.311.
5. See: Editor's note to J.D.A.N., where the editor states:
"Le grand public semble l'avoir (Journal d'un homme de 40 ans) particulièrement apprécié".
6. This is the view of Walter Redfern stated in his The private world of Jean Giono, p.69.
7. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Louis Guilloux, of the 6th January 1934. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
8. This is stated in an unpublished letter from André Malraux to Jean Guéhenno, of the 15th July 1934 : "Envoyez-moi... les épreuves de L'Homme de 40 ans". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno)
9. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Giono of the 19th July 1934. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
10. This is stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 20th July 1934. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
11. For information on publication see: publishers' notes in J.40. p.264.

12. Gabriel Marcel, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe Nouvelle,
26 janvier 1935, p.90.
13. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
14. "L'homme qui lit", "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", par Jean Guéhenno",
Le Figaro, 17 novembre 1934, p.5.
15. René Lalou, "Le livre de la semaine: Journal d'un homme de 40 ans",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 24 novembre 1934, p.1.
16. Guéhenno's thanks are expressed in an unpublished letter to
René Lalou of the 24th november 1934. (In the collection of
Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
17. Peñé is not referred to by name in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans.
It is however directly mentioned in C.V. p.17.
18. In Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Fougères is referred to only as F...
19. Gabriel Marcel, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe Nouvelle,
26 janvier 1935, p.90.
20. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
21. J.B. Séverac, "Journal d'un de 40 ans", Le Populaire,
25 décembre 1934, p.4.
22. See the account of the École Normale Supérieure in Chapter One.
23. See: Albert Thibaudet, La République des Professeurs, p.197.
24. André Malraux, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", La Nouvelle Revue
Française, Tome XLIV, 1 janvier 1935, p.148.
25. "L'homme qui lit", Journal d'un homme de 40 ans par Jean Guéhenno,
Le Figaro, 17 novembre 1934, p.5. Part of this quotation is taken
from J.40. p.189.
26. See: Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme, Tome 11, p.367.

27. Robert Brasillach, "Jean Guéhenno. Journal d' un homme de 40 ans",
L'Action Française, 3 janvier 1935, p.3.
28. Ibid., p.3.
29. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
30. See: Robert Brasillach, "Jean Guéhenno. Journal d'un homme de
40 ans", L'Action Française, 3 janvier 1935, p.3.
31. Robert Kemp, "Les Livres," La Liberté, 7 septembre 1934, p.2.
32. For this information and source of quotation see: André Cuisenier,
Jules Romains et Les Hommes de Bonne Volonté. Paris, Flammarion,
1954, vol.111, pp.237-245.
33. Guéhenno sent a letter addressed to Jules Romains beginning
"Cher Monsieur et ami" and including a cheque for the rent.
This is an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jules Romains,
of the 11th July 1930.(In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
34. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
35. Ibid., p.3.
36. André Rousseaux, "La Semaine Littéraire. Un jeune vieillard",
Le Figaro, 1 septembre 1934.
37. Georges May, L'autobiographie. Paris, Presses Universitaires
de France, 1979. p.23.
38. Ibid., p.25.
39. See: André Rousseaux, "Le Semaine Littéraire. Un jeune
vieillard", Le Figaro, 1 septembre 1934.
40. Ibid.,
41. Georges May, L'autobiographie, p.106.

42. Simone de Beauvoir, La force de l'âge. Paris, Coll. "Folio", 1952. p.10.
43. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
44. Gabriel Marcel, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe Nouvelle, 26 janvier 1935, p.90.
45. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
46. René Lalou, "Le livre de la semaine. Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 24 novembre 1934, p.1.
47. In a later work (C.V. p.94) Guéhenno admits that his father did leave the working-class to become a commercial traveller.
48. Robert Brasillach, "Jean Guéhenno. Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", L'Action Française, 3 janvier 1935, p.3.
49. Guéhenno's father could not accept being branded as a coward.
See: J.40. p.78.
50. André Malraux, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", La Nouvelle Revue Française, Tome XLIV, 1 janvier 1935, p.151.
51. Gabriel Marcel, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe Nouvelle, 26 janvier 1935, p.90.
52. Robert Brasillach, "Jean Guéhenno. Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", L'Action Française, 3 janvier 1935, p.3.
53. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
54. "L'homme qui lit", "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, par Jean Guéhenno", Le Figaro, 17 novembre 1934, p.5.
55. W.D. Redfern, Paul Nizan. Committed literature in a conspiratorial world. Princeton, New Jersey. Princeton University Press, 1972, p.55.

56. Paul Nizan, Antoine Bloyé. Paris, Grasset, 1933. p.114.
57. Ibid., p.135.
58. See: ibid., p.136.
59. "L'homme qui lit", "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans par Jean Guéhenno", Le Figaro, 17 novembre 1934, p.5.
60. Ibid., p.5.
61. André Malraux, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", La Nouvelle Revue Française, Tome XLIV, 1 janvier 1935, p.150.
62. J.B. Séverac. "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Le Populaire, 25 décembre 1934, p.4.
63. André Malraux, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", La Nouvelle Revue Française, Tome XLIV, 1 janvier 1935, p.148.
64. Ibid., p.149.
65. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
66. "L'homme qui lit", "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans par Jean Guéhenno", Le Figaro, 17 novembre 1934, p.5.
67. Rene Lalou, "Le livre de la semaine: Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 24 novembre 1934, p.1.
68. Gabriel Marcel, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe Nouvelle, 26 janvier 1935, p.90.
69. André Malraux, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", La Nouvelle Revue Française, Tome XLIV, 1 janvier 1935, p.148.
70. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
71. Ibid., p.3.
72. See: Chapter title E.E. p.85. See also: E.E. p.93: "le moi-homme tente de se perdre dans le moi-humanité".

73. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan,
of the 26th September 1936. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
74. "Homme de série" is the title of the third chapter of Journal d'un
homme de 40 ans. See: J.40. p.53.
75. Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 24th August 1934.
In Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.307.
76. J.B. Séverac, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Le Populaire,
25 décembre 1934, p.4.
77. Thérive states: "brusquement il nous apprend son entrée à
l'É.N.S." André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935,
p.3.
78. Robert Brasillach, "Jean Guéhenno. Journal d'un homme de 40 ans",
L'Action Française, 3 janvier 1935, p.3.
79. Ibid., p.3.
80. Philippe Lejeune, Le pacte autobiographique. Paris, Éditions
du Seuil, 1975. p.14.
81. See: *ibid.*, p.26.
82. Ibid., pp.23-24.
83. Georges May, L'autobiographie, p.180.
84. Philippe Lejeune, Le pacte autobiographique, p.31.
85. See: *ibid.*, p.36.
86. André Malraux, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", La Nouvelle Revue
Française, Tome XLIV, 1 janvier 1935, p.149.
87. Ibid., pp. 150-151.
88. André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
89. See: Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme, Tome 11, p.224.

90. André Malraux, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", La Nouvelle Revue Française, Tome XLIV, 1 janvier, p.150.
91. Gabriel Marcel, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe Nouvelle, 26 janvier 1935, p.90.
92. See: Louis Guilloux, Carnets 1921-1944. Paris, Gallimard, 1978. p.43.
93. Jean Guéhenno quoted in ibid., p.43.
94. See: Mary Jean Matthews Green, Louis Guilloux - An artisan of Language, p.20.
95. See: ibid., p.20.
96. Albert Camus, "Avant-Propos", in Louis Guilloux, La maison du peuple. Paris, Grasset, Livre de Poche, 1953, p.15.
97. For information on the father in La maison du peuple, see: Louis Guilloux, La maison du peuple. Paris, Grasset, 1953, p.42.
98. See: ibid., p.60.
99. Ibid., p.51.
100. Ibid., p.143.
101. See: ibid., pp. 158-162.
102. Maurice Dubourg in his Eugène Dabit et André Gide. Paris, Maurice Pernet, coll. "Plaisir du bibliophile, 1953. p.12, states that after the war "(Dabit) fut secouru matériellement par ses parents qui devaient acheter, au cours de cette époque, le fameux Hôtel du Nord".
103. See: Guéhenno's article in Vendredi on the occasion of Dabit's death, referred to in Chapter One, footnote 142.

104. See: Eugène Dabit, Hôtel du Nord. Paris, Éditions Denoel et Steele, 1929. p.92.
105. See: *ibid.*, p.221.
106. See: *ibid.*, p.48.
107. See: *ibid.*, p.196.
108. This is the view of Robert Kemp, J.B. Séverac, René Lalou and "L'homme qui lit".
109. See: Alexander Werth, The Twilight of France 1933-1940. London, Hamish Hamilton, 1942. p.8.
110. See: *ibid.*, p.9.
111. See for example: *ibid.*, p.12. Werth claims that the Daladier government of January-October 1933 was the last stable government before the events of February 1934.
112. René Lalou, "Le livre de la semaine: Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 24 novembre 1934, p.1.
113. See: J.40. pp.151-152, where Guéhenno states: "j'étais fier... de ma veste neuve, de ce qu'elle signifiait d'audace et de renoncement... J'étais joyeux d'une joie aigre et fébrile comme le vent".
114. See: *ibid.*, p.170, where Guéhenno describes how as a result of a clerical error he was given leave in Paris and first experienced doubts about the war.
115. See: *ibid.*, pp.174-176.
116. This is the view of Micheline Tison-Braun in La crise de l'humanisme, Tome 11, p.36.

117. Walter Redfern, The private world of Jean Giono, p.63.
118. See: *ibid.*, pp.64-65.
119. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Giono,
of the 19th July 1934. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
120. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to François Mauriac,
of August 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
121. This article is referred to in Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years-Life, vol.
IV, Eve of War 1933-1941. Translated by T. Shebunina and Y. Kapp.
London, Macgibbon and Kee, 1963, p.219.
122. Guéhenno refers to Durckheim only by initials. See: J.40. p.180.
123. See: *ibid.*, p.188.
124. See: E.E. Prologue and C.P. p.42, where Guéhenno claims that war
forged solidarity.
125. René Lalou, "Le livre de la semaine: "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 24 novembre 1934, p.1.
126. First presented in Henri Barbusse, Le Feu.
127. See: Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme, Tome 11.
p.70.
128. Roland Dorgelès, Les Croix de Bois. Paris, Albin Michel,
1959. p.344
129. Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, Terre des hommes. Paris, Gallimard,
1939. p.204.
130. See: Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme, Tome 11, p.64.
131. See: *ibid.*, p.70.
132. See: *ibid.*, p.62.

133. See: *ibid.*, p.66.
134. See: André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935, p.3.
135. *Ibid.*, p.3.
136. See: Georges Pascal, La pensée d'Alain, p.177. For the view that in Alain's opinion war harms business interests, see:
Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme, Tome 11. p.171.
137. Robert Kemp, "Les Livres", La Liberté, 7 septembre 1934, p.2.
138. Gabriel Marcel, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe Nouvelle, 26 janvier 1935, p.90.
139. *Ibid.*, p.90.
140. *Ibid.*, p.90.
141. Roger Martin du Gard, Les Thibault. L'Été 1914. Paris, Gallimard, Oeuvres complètes 11, 1955. p.179.
142. Roger Martin du Gard, Les Thibault. L'Été 1914. Paris, Gallimard, vol. VL, 1953. p.217.
143. See: Paul Louis, Histoire du socialisme en France 1789-1945, p.295.
144. See: *ibid.*, p.290.
145. André Chamson, Roux le bandit. London, George G. Harrap & Co., 1958. p.102.
146. W. Lough, "Introduction" in *ibid.*, p. XVI.
147. André Chamson, Roux le bandit, p.17.
148. See: *ibid.*, p.54.
149. *Ibid.*, p.27.
150. See: *ibid.*, p.17.
151. *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

152. Ibid., p.79.
153. Ibid., p.97.
154. Ibid., p.96.
155. See: *ibid.*, p.71.
156. This is stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat, of the 16th August 1934. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
157. See: Paul Louis, Histoire du socialisme en France 1789-1945, pp. 354-355.
158. See: Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme, Tome 11, p.90.
159. See: *ibid.*, p.97.
160. See: *ibid.*, pp.99-100.
161. Mary Jean Matthews Green in her Louis Guilloux - An artisan of Language, p.95, claims that "The Russian Revolution, as it functions in Le Sang Noir, is not so much a historical reality as a vague ideal which serves as a symbol of hope". The same is true of the function of the Russian Revolution in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans.
162. Louis Guilloux, Le Sang Noir. Paris, Gallimard, 1935. p.255.
163. Ibid., p.259.
164. This is because in *ibid.*, pp.251-254, the real anger of the rioters is directed against the war and Poincaré.
165. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years-Life, vol.IV, Eve of War 1933-1941, p.13.
166. See: J.40. p.212.

167. Paul Louis, in his Histoire du socialisme en France 1789-1945, p.322, claims that the effect of the Russian Revolution on French workers was very profound.
168. J.B. Séverac, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Le Populaire, 25 décembre 1934, p.4.
169. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Giono, of the 2nd April 1935. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
170. In a letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 14th January 1936, Rolland expresses his sorrow at Guéhenno's departure from Europe. In Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.364.
171. This article was published as "La mort inutile", Vendredi, 5 février 1937, p.1.
172. Jean Guéhenno, "Chant de confiance en la Russie" (Preface to the Soviet edition of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans), published in J.F. p.202.
173. Ibid., pp.202-203.
174. See: ibid., p.200.
175. Ibid., p.200.
176. See: C.D.V.E., p.103, where Guéhenno states: "J'avais... espéré ce voyage toute ma vie depuis ces jours de 1917 où une grande lueur s'était levée à l'Orient. Invité vers 1936, j'hésitai, j'avais peur d'être dans le cas de répéter Gide".

Chapter Five

Europe

The undoubted success of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans was partly due to Guéhenno's prestige as a public figure, which he owed primarily to his involvement with the review Europe. Although Guéhenno's reputation as an essayist has already been noted with respect to L'Évangile éternel, Caliban parle, Conversion à l'humain and Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, he is also best remembered as the editor of this review, and later as a director of Vendredi. Consequently in order to understand Guéhenno's important relationship with Europe it is necessary to go back in time to 1919 when Romain Rolland first suggested founding a Left-wing literary review, and more particularly to 1932, when Guéhenno took control of Europe, becoming its sole editor.

From the evidence provided in Romain Rolland's correspondence, it appears that the origins of Europe go back to the 26th August 1919, when he wrote to Rabindranath Tagore, stating that he wanted to start a review: "il ne s'agirait nullement de la politique, mais des trésors de la pensée - de l'art, de la science et de la foi"⁽¹⁾. With the help of Paul Colin and René Arcos, Romain Rolland tried to turn his proposal into a reality, although initially with little success. There seemed to be no possibility of starting a Left-wing review at the time of a "Bloc National" government, and by the end of 1922 Romain Rolland gave up hope of realising the necessary capital for his project⁽²⁾. According to Lucie Mazaauric the venture was only saved because André Gide gave Romain Rolland financial assistance, thereby becoming the co-founder of the review and the beneficiary of future royalties⁽³⁾. The first issue of Europe finally appeared on the 15th February 1923, and by June of that year it achieved

sales of 1,600 copies. The first administration included Paul Colin and René Arcos as directors, with Benjamin Crémieux and Jean-Richard Bloch as editors. Nevertheless by October 1923 Crémieux and Bloch were complaining to Romain Rolland that the directors were neglecting their duties. As a result of this complaint Colin and Arcos became secretaries, whilst Crémieux was promoted to director, a post he held until 1932. The changes did not however satisfy Romain Rolland, who was disappointed with Europe under Crémieux. Of relevance here is the personal antagonism Romain Rolland felt towards Crémieux and Colin, who refused to publish material which he submitted to them⁽⁴⁾. Despite these internal difficulties, by 1927 Europe increased in size from 128 to 144 pages and the administration was also expanded at this time. Crémieux remained as director, but Léon Bazalgette joined Arcos as joint "rédacteur en chef", whilst Jacques Robertfrance and Jean Prévost were newly appointed as "secrétaires de rédaction"⁽⁵⁾. The arrival of Bazalgette is important, because it was through him that Guéhenno first became involved in Europe. Bazalgette had been Guéhenno's friend since 1919, when a common interest in Walt Whitman brought them together⁽⁶⁾, so Guéhenno was happy to help Bazalgette in the last twelve months of his editorship⁽⁷⁾. Bazalgette died in December 1928⁽⁸⁾, but in the final weeks of his life he persuaded Guéhenno to take over as editor, despite the latter's reservations on this matter. Recalling the events in his notes for a Radio programme on Europe with P. Sipriot, Guéhenno states: "quand il se sentit mourir, il exprima le *vœu* que je la dirige"⁽⁹⁾.

Although Guéhenno took over from Bazalgette soon after the publication of Caliban parle, the book where he called for the cultural elite to unite with the masses, he himself remained an individualist. In his letter to Romain Rolland of the 12th November 1928 he made clear his position when he warned Rolland that he expected to have total freedom of thought⁽¹⁰⁾. This very quality however, evidently appealed to Romain Rolland, who saw in Guéhenno a latter-day Charles Péguy. The comparison with Péguy had already been made by Daniel Halévy, but to Romain Rolland it was so self-evident, that he even referred to it in his letters to Guéhenno. In the letter of the 22nd November 1932 he hails Guéhenno as "le nouveau Péguy"⁽¹¹⁾. Later in March 1934, having read Guéhenno's work in Europe, Romain Rolland again thinks of Péguy: "il m'a semblé que Péguy reparaissait"⁽¹²⁾. The comparison with Péguy is neither gratuitous, nor is it merely intended to flatter. Romain Rolland knew Péguy well, having taught him at the École Normale Supérieure while the latter studied there, and moreover it was in Péguy's Cahiers de la Quinzaine that Romain Rolland published his Beethoven and his Jean-Christophe⁽¹³⁾. The biographical as well as the ideological similarities between Péguy and Guéhenno are indeed striking. Both were "boursiers"⁽¹⁴⁾ and both attended the Lycée Louis-le-Grand in Paris⁽¹⁵⁾, as well as the École Normale Supérieure⁽¹⁶⁾. With respect to their ideas Péguy, like Guéhenno, believed in the absolute nature of truth⁽¹⁷⁾, but even more importantly he understood revolution to be a moral concept. The formula which Péguy printed on the inside of his first Cahiers de la Quinzaine corresponds exactly with Guéhenno's views: "La révolution sociale sera morale, ou ne

sera pas"⁽¹⁸⁾. Guéhenno himself rarely refers to Péguy in his writing, but in La Mort de autres of 1968 he acknowledges that he became interested in him after his death in the trenches⁽¹⁹⁾: "Je ne l'ai lu qu'après la guerre; alors j'ai voulu tout lire, et je l'ai admiré et l'admire toujours, mais je l'ai mieux aimé que je ne l'aime" (L.M.D.A. p.50). As a latter-day Péguy, Guéhenno was most welcome in Romain Rolland's Europe. Romain Rolland had been a collaborator of Péguy on the Cahiers de la Quinzaine⁽²⁰⁾ and it was the spirit of that review, which he hoped to continue in Europe. Referring to the review as it appeared in 1925, Joseph Kvapil states: "Europe continuait dans un certain sens les Cahiers de la Quinzaine de Péguy"⁽²¹⁾.

Notwithstanding the similarity between Guéhenno and Péguy, Romain Rolland found the former to be particularly well-suited to Europe because Guéhenno had no party allegiances. In a letter to Guéhenno of the 5th November 1928, Romain Rolland gives Guéhenno's freedom from political parties as one of the reasons for wanting him on Europe⁽²²⁾. Himself hostile to political parties, Romain Rolland advised Guéhenno to retain his independence of them: "même dans la guerre, ne vous liez à aucun parti"⁽²³⁾. Furthermore, in a private letter of the 20th August 1929 he instructed Guéhenno that Europe should be "en dehors des partis, qui tous marchent... vers l'écrasement des libertés"⁽²⁴⁾. Guéhenno always remembered Romain Rolland's advice, and in Carnets du vieil écrivain he quotes a long fragment of a letter in which Romain Rolland reminded him: "gardez intacte votre indépendance" (C.D.V.E. p.167). Despite his doubts concerning the authoritarian Crémieux⁽²⁵⁾ and

the salary of only 1,200 francs a month, Guéhenno accepted the post of "rédacteur en chef" of Europe in early November 1928, a post which initially also involved editing Rieder's literary editions⁽²⁶⁾, the Prosateurs français modernes⁽²⁷⁾. Negotiations over terms continued for another fortnight, but on the 25th November 1928 Guéhenno wrote to Romain Rolland, informing him that he had definitely accepted the editorship of Europe⁽²⁸⁾. The first issue for which he was responsible was that of January 1929⁽²⁹⁾, for which he shared the credit with the deceased Bazalgette⁽³⁰⁾.

Guéhenno's first years on Europe were not a happy period. In May 1929 he wrote his first letter to Romain Rolland expressing his disillusionment with the role of editor⁽³¹⁾. Although he was rapidly relieved of his responsibility for the Prosateurs français modernes⁽³²⁾ to enable him to concentrate on the review, Guéhenno continually threatened to leave Europe. Romain Rolland had to intervene three times in the first two years to prevent this happening⁽³³⁾, but although Guéhenno remained as editor, he felt little enthusiasm for his work. In his letter to Romain Rolland of the 2nd August 1931 he describes his feelings about the review: "L'effort me paraît sans proportion avec le résultat"⁽³⁴⁾. Guéhenno's attitude disappointed Romain Rolland, whose letter to Arcos of the 6th March 1929 is strongly critical of the "rédacteur en chef": "Guéhenno... est perpétuellement attiré par les plus équivoques de la littérature... (il) n'a depuis six mois, rien apporté à la revue"⁽³⁵⁾. More muted criticism is included in Romain Rolland's letter to Guéhenno of the 3rd December 1931, where he accuses Guéhenno of publishing material of little

value⁽³⁶⁾. There is little doubt that the main reason for Guéhenno's poor performance as editor was his inability to co-operate with his colleagues on the editorial board of Europe. Officially, responsibility for the review was claimed by Crémieux, Guéhenno and the deceased Bazalgette from January to August 1929⁽³⁷⁾, by Crémieux, Guéhenno, Dominique Braga and the deceased Bazalgette from August 1929 to January 1932⁽³⁸⁾, by Crémieux and Guéhenno from January to September 1932⁽³⁹⁾, and by Guéhenno alone after that date⁽⁴⁰⁾. With the exception of Crémieux, who held the post of "directeur" throughout the period, Guéhenno's other colleagues all claimed the title of "rédacteur en chef"⁽⁴¹⁾. This collective leadership resulted in a great deal of ill-feeling and it favoured a situation where Jacques Robertfrance, Duhamel and Arcos constantly undermined Guéhenno's decisions. The confusion was such that on the 5th July 1929 Romain Rolland felt obliged to enquire whether Guéhenno and Robertfrance were still in charge of Europe⁽⁴²⁾. Guéhenno's battle with Robertfrance was especially bitter. In his letter to Romain Rolland of the 18th September 1930 Guéhenno describes Robertfrance as authoritarian, insubordinate, and guilty of having included an article in Europe against his wishes⁽⁴³⁾. In September 1932 Guéhenno accused Robertfrance of being over-ambitious, which allegedly manifested itself in a three-year campaign to undermine his control of the review⁽⁴⁴⁾. The death of Robertfrance on the 31st October 1932⁽⁴⁵⁾ finally resolved the conflict. With Braga, Crémieux and Robertfrance gone, Guéhenno was left with complete control over Europe in late 1932. The earlier difficulties with Duhamel and Arcos which left Guéhenno "sans autorité"⁽⁴⁶⁾ disappeared, so he was now able to edit Europe competently and without interference. The change was immediately noted by

Romain Rolland, whose letter to Marcel Martinet draws attention to the improvement in Guéhenno's performance⁽⁴⁷⁾. Guéhenno himself received a letter from Romain Rolland, dated the 22nd November 1932, which is full of praise for both Europe and its editor: "vous êtes appelé à jouer un grand rôle moral dans notre nouvelle France"⁽⁴⁸⁾

Although Europe covers a long period of Guéhenno's life, the basic ideas he proposes remain consistent throughout the period, so it is possible to consider the review as a unified whole. The immediate problems raised by Guéhenno's involvement in Europe concern his day-to-day role on the review and also the format which as editor, he adopted for it. Of far greater importance however, are the ideas which he put forward in the monthly "Notes de lecture", these being articles which outline what he considers to be the review's major areas of interest. The problems he raises here show he still adhered to the ideas expressed earlier in L'Évangile éternel, and Caliban parle, hence his strong defence of individual civil liberties. At the same time however, in Europe Guéhenno explores more general issues which demonstrate his social concerns. Consequently Europe's main areas of interest which require detailed analysis, are the change in human nature taking place in the Soviet Union, peace, and how peace can be best assured through the implementation of the European ideal. Although it is impossible to overlook Guéhenno's dominant role in the review, Europe also represents a collective effort. It is therefore necessary to consider the attention given to the pacifist and anti-fascist fronts, as well as the roles of Jean-Richard Bloch and Romain Rolland.

Relieved of the burdensome Prosateurs français modernes in mid 1929, Guéhenno could concentrate on formulating Europe's editorial policy. Under his leadership the review attracted contributions expressing all shades of opinion on the Left, hence in his notes for the Sipriot radio programme Guéhenno recalls that "la revue voulait être internationaliste, socialiste, libérale, pacifiste"⁽⁴⁹⁾. In La Foi difficile he remembers publishing the radical Jean Prévost, the socialist Ignazio Silone, the anarchists Sacco and Vanzetti's letters, as well as the communists Maiakowski, Gorki and Boris Pilniak. Trotsky, his supporters Victor Serge and Panait Istrati are also mentioned, as are Jean Giono, Pierre Drieu la Rochelle and even the "White" Russian Remizow⁽⁵⁰⁾. As "rédacteur en chef", Guéhenno received young writers each Thursday⁽⁵¹⁾ in Europe's office, situated in the building occupied by the publisher Rieder, at 7 place Saint-Sulpice⁽⁵²⁾. Office is perhaps too grand a name. Herbert R. Lottman describes it as "une unique pièce chichement éclairée et bourrée de livres et de manuscrits"⁽⁵³⁾. In this room Guéhenno could confirm the view of writers which he expressed in Caliban parle. Although in La Foi difficile he accepts that he met some new prophets, he also remembers that many of his visitors were self-indulgent poseurs⁽⁵⁴⁾. As editor, Guéhenno also took upon himself most of the work involved in preparing each issue of Europe. Writing to Romain Rolland in July 1935, he states: "je compose la revue... fais presque toute la besogne... depuis des années"⁽⁵⁵⁾. The effort was soon rewarded in terms of sales. Guéhenno doubled the number of readers in his first two years as editor⁽⁵⁶⁾ and attained sales of 4,900 copies by the end of 1932⁽⁵⁷⁾. Success continued throughout 1935, as Guéhenno claims in a letter

to Romain Rolland dated the 30th July 1935, that "jamais la revue n'a été autant lue"⁽⁵⁸⁾. Nevertheless Europe was never a financial success. In La Foi difficile Guéhenno describes the review as poor⁽⁵⁹⁾, and in a letter to Romain Rolland of November 1930 he complains about his salary: "Je n'ai nul besoin d'Europe... On m'y paie terriblement mal"⁽⁶⁰⁾. Despite these financial problems however, Guéhenno not only succeeded in increasing the review's sales, but also managed to stabilise a team of regular contributors. In his notes for the Sipriot radio programme he recalls: "j'ai gardé naturellement les collaborateurs de la revue d'avant mon arrivée. J'en recrutai de nouveaux: Dabit, Blanzat, Chamson, Guilloux, Giono, Berl, Pierre Gerôme"⁽⁶¹⁾. The whole team is listed by Joseph Kvapil, and includes Jean Prévost, Paul Nizan, R. Vivier, Jean Blanzat, Gabriel Audisio, André Chamson, C. Sénéchal, Léon Moussinac, Eugène Dabit, Louis Guilloux and Jean Giono⁽⁶²⁾. Guéhenno does however cast doubts about the existence of an actual "team". His letter to Romain Rolland of the 24th August 1933 refers to the difficulties faced by Europe in view of the divisions among writers⁽⁶³⁾. In his last work, Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs he states categorically that "le vrai... c'est qu'il n'y avait pas d'équipe d'Europe parce qu'il n'y avait encore nulle part d'esprit d'Europe" (D.L.D.P. p.50).

With respect to the content and format of Europe, what is particularly striking is the dominance of original works and the wholly negative attitude towards literary criticism. Relegated to the back pages of the review, the quality of literary criticism in Europe was frankly described by Guéhenno himself as very poor⁽⁶⁴⁾.

This was not however a matter of great concern for him, because he was in principle hostile to critics. Writing to Romain Rolland in September 1930, Guéhenno claimed that he ignored them, adding: "il y a peut-être au fond de moi un grand mépris de mes contemporains ... Je suis mon seul juge"⁽⁶⁵⁾. Guéhenno was in any case faced with a more serious difficulty, as French writers refused to collaborate on Europe. Suarès⁽⁶⁶⁾ and Duhamel⁽⁶⁷⁾ were not alone in shunning the review. Guéhenno's correspondence with Romain Rolland is therefore frequently concerned with this problem. He complains about the lack of an "esprit d'Europe" and regrets the unwillingness of good writers to collaborate with him⁽⁶⁸⁾. Given such circumstances, a review whose purpose was the support of victims of oppression throughout the world, became a focus for unscrupulous second-rate talent, people whom Guéhenno terms "arrivistes"⁽⁶⁹⁾. He was especially critical of the selfish attitude of communist writers, "qui ne pensent jamais lui (Europe) rien devoir"⁽⁷⁰⁾. A particular target of Guéhenno's anger in the 1930 s was Nizan's review Crise, which was quite consciously "tourné contre nous"⁽⁷¹⁾. By the time Guéhenno took sole charge of Europe in late 1932, he was despairing about the possibility of recruiting talented French writers: "peut-être n'y a-t-il plus place dans ce monde mécanisé pour une pensée vraiment libre"⁽⁷²⁾. Although this situation was in itself regrettable, it also led to positive results, because it obliged Guéhenno to widen the scope of the review. In November 1931 he informed Romain Rolland of the necessity of making Europe international in character, given the impossibility of finding good French writers⁽⁷³⁾. For the lack of an alternative the review looked to translations to fill its pages - a fortunate decision

which prevented Europe becoming a second-rate Nouvelle Revue Française⁽⁷⁴⁾. Lottman believes that Europe, "fondée en 1923 (fut) destinée à publier la meilleure littérature étrangère aussi bien que française"⁽⁷⁵⁾. The initiative in this matter is claimed by Guéhenno:

"La plupart (des écrivains) et nos amis mêmes... allaient où la mode, le snobisme ... l'argent enfin les appelait. Je mendiais souvent pour obtenir d'eux quelques pages. Je recourais beaucoup à des traductions: cela fit l'originalité de la revue" (D.L.D.P. p.50).

At times Europe's taste extended to the exotic. In May 1930 the review published the poems of Katayama, Ozaki and Vêda, while in July a series of Korean stories appears, edited by R.H. Seu. In general however, with the major exceptions of works by Gandhi, Nehru and Tagore, whose publication reflected Romain Rolland's and Guéhenno's personal interest in India, the review concentrated on Western literature. During his years as editor, Guéhenno did succeed in publishing work by major French authors despite considerable difficulties, but with the exception of Nizan and Romain Rolland⁽⁷⁶⁾, few writers contributed anything of substance. Nevertheless the list of Europe's contributors includes such names as Alain, Aragon, Claude Aveline, Barbusse, Céline, Drieu la Rochelle, Malraux, Montherlant, Nizan, Paulhan, Romain Rolland. More substantial both in its length and in the quality of the material contributed however, is the list of the review's foreign collaborators. John Dos Passos, Theodore Drieser, Ehrenbourg, Gandhi, Bertrand Russell, Faulkner, Gorki, Cecil Day Lewis, Waldo Frank, Heinrich Mann, Thomas Mann, D.H. Lawrence, G.B. Shaw,

Nehru and Tagore all had their works published during Guéhenno's editorship.

The list of Europe's contributors gives a general impression of its ideological profile, because of the almost complete absence of Right-wing authors. Nevertheless, since Europe's contents represent what was available for publication, rather than that which Guéhenno would have liked included, evidence of the review's ideological concerns must be looked for elsewhere. This being the case, Guéhenno's monthly "Notes de lecture" which began in July 1929, and Jean-Richard Bloch's "Commentaires" deserve particular attention. Written specifically for Europe, these regular articles constitute a clear and unified statement of the review's ideological concerns, and are furthermore written by two men, who for many years shared a common perspective⁽⁷⁷⁾.

The final problem posed by Europe's format is the extent to which it suited the reader. Guéhenno believed the majority of his readers were primary-school teachers and claimed that his public was not unlike that of the Cahiers de la Quinzaine, Pages Libres and La Grande Revue. Expressing his wishes as much as the facts, he adds that it was patriotic, but that it understood France as a series of ideas rather than material values⁽⁷⁸⁾.

Guéhenno's basic account concerning his readers' origins is confirmed by Paul Nizan: "Europe a quelques abonnés dans le corps enseignant"⁽⁷⁹⁾.

The format of the review, with its literary and philosophical articles is therefore perfectly appropriate to the intellectual capacity of its readers. Europe was a Left-wing review, but it was a review catering for teachers, who were interested in political as well as

intellectual issues, and the importance of the latter point cannot be overstated.

Romain Rolland, in a major criticism of Europe under Guéhenno's leadership, described the review as vague and dilletantish in the key areas of thought, literature and art⁽⁸⁰⁾. The criticism is important, because it draws attention to a major characteristic of Europe, which is its tendency to explore problems from several angles, rather than pronounce definitive opinions on them. In part this is a consequence of the review's non-partisan position, but it also reflects the nature of Europe's essential preoccupation. Its single most important concern is the problem of the human condition and this is so vast a problem, that it does not lend itself easily to simple dogmatic pronouncements. In emphasising the problem of the human condition, Guéhenno believes that he is responding to an issue which dominated the thinking of his generation. In his review of Malraux's La Condition Humaine of 1933 he praises Malraux: "d'avoir en isolant... ces mots si simples et si grands, (et) en en faisant un titre... résumé le travail des écrivains de sa génération et de quelques autres plus vieux"⁽⁸¹⁾. Guéhenno finds confirmation of his own view of Man as a seeker of personal perfection in the work of Malraux. Consequently he quotes Malraux's views, where they coincide with his own: "Il est très rare qu'un homme puisse supporter sa condition d'homme... Tout homme veut devenir Dieu"⁽⁸²⁾. Recalling in Carnets du vieil écrivain the impact made by Malraux's book, Guehenno refers to the contemporary significance of the problem of the human condition and adds: "(Malraux) avait... publié le livre que, tous, nous avions rêvé d'écrire" (C.D.V.E. p.160).

In the two major texts which pre-date his appointment to Europe Guéhenno makes it clear that he regards the individual as his ultimate concern. It is therefore to be expected that when he presents the problems posed by the human condition in "Notes de lecture", he does so from an individualist perspective. The "Notes de lecture", Guéhenno's monthly contributions to Europe which began in February 1929, were originally intended as book reviews⁽⁸³⁾. However, because Guéhenno did not like literary criticism, he extended the scope of his articles, with the result that they became in Pascal Ory's words "beaucoup plus qu'une suite de comptes rendus, (c'était) autant d'examens de conscience sur les questions qui le (Guéhenno) définissent"⁽⁸⁴⁾. At their best, the "Notes de lecture" show Guéhenno using the framework of a discussion on a book to put forward his personal philosophy, which is that of L'Évangile éternel and Caliban parle. Once again therefore, this time in the context of a discussion of Benjamin Constant, he returned to the theme of Man as a replacement for God. In Constant's work, Guéhenno finds "(des) paroles... pleines de sens pour une humanité qui n'a plus à compter que sur elle-même"⁽⁸⁵⁾. This humanist view is again linked with the individual and his spiritual existence. Referring to Thomas Mann's definition of "le meilleur" in an article of November 1932, Guéhenno uses Mann's words to express his own view of the individual's purpose in life: "Le meilleur"... (c'est) celui qui passait sa vie à se dominer lui-même"⁽⁸⁶⁾. Individualism remains central to an understanding of Guéhenno's position. In a letter to Romain Rolland of September 1933 he states emphatically that: "nous demeurons seuls, des individus, malgré nous... peut-être y a-t-il en moi aussi un vieux ferment d'anarchie"⁽⁸⁷⁾. In Europe however,

he prefers a more oblique presentation of his view. When in February 1935 Guéhenno devotes his "Notes de lecture" to Paul Valéry's speech to the Académie Française, where Valéry considers the contemporary threat to the individual, he allows Valéry to speak for them both:

"Depuis bien des siècles, l'humanité occidentale n'a cessé de poursuivre l'édification de la personnalité... la valeur civile, politique, juridique, et métaphysique de l'individu a été créée. (Aujourd'hui) l'homme est conçu... comme élément qui ne vaut que dans le système social, qui ne vit que par ce système et pour lui"(88).

Valéry's statement clearly reflects Guéhenno's own position in Caliban parle, where he makes the personal, spiritual improvement of the individual his chief preoccupation.

In Caliban parle Guéhenno's atheism and individualism led him to consider the importance of the individual's thought. In the "Notes de lecture" this is also frequently a matter of concern to him. His article on D.H. Lawrence of May 1934 quotes Aldous Huxley's remarks on the importance of thought: "Dans les ténèbres incommensurables de ce monde, la flamme de (la) pensée (de l'homme) ... creuse, pour ainsi dire, une petite caverne de lumière... dans lequel... il vit... et trouve son existence"(89). Guéhenno's commitment to rationality in Caliban parle is likewise reflected in the "Notes de lecture". In "À propos de Descartes" of May 1931 he is adamant that "le seul Descartes dont nous gardons mémoire est... celui qui... prit la "résolution d'employer toute sa vie à cultiver sa raison" et rêva de rendre l'homme "maître et possesseur de la nature"(90). In "Les paroles restent" of July 1931 he praises

Jaurès for the speeches which he made, "fort de tout son savoir et de toute sa raison"⁽⁹¹⁾. Later in December 1935 Anatole France earns Guéhenno's praise for the same reason as does Jaurès: "le plus profond de lui c'était... le rationalisme"⁽⁹²⁾. Although Guéhenno's restatement of his belief in rationality is a significant feature of the "Notes de lecture", what is more important is the development of that belief in a new and surprising direction. In the course of the articles written during 1930-1935, Guéhenno makes clear his view that rationality is related to individualism and that the view of Man as a collective being leads to the destruction of essential human qualities. Such an argument is obviously difficult to reconcile with Guéhenno's professed socialism, but at the same time it is a logical consequence of the individualist position outlined in his first two major works. In the articles "Les réfractaires" and "La Condition humaine" of May 1930 and June 1933, Guéhenno claims that Man is always alone⁽⁹³⁾, a claim which reflects his understanding of the term Man to mean the individual. In "Jaurès ou la révolution rationnelle" of November 1933 he relates individualism to rationalism by introducing his personal view of revolution into the argument. Such a relationship is possible because revolution for Guéhenno is individual spiritual self-improvement, and rational thought is both the means and the end of that process. Collective behaviour is therefore theoretically irrelevant to him, because "les bandes ne pensent pas"⁽⁹⁴⁾. Nevertheless he acknowledges that the collectivity can tempt the individual to become a part of it, and this is a temptation which he regards as dangerous, because it leads to the destruction of

the individual and hence of rational thought:

"Des millions de communistes se sont fait hitlériens... (car) la grande peur des hommes de ce temps est d'être seuls. Il semble que nous ayons besoin d'être un troupeau... (Mais la Révolution) c'est la volonté que ~~tant d'~~hommes-masse... deviennent enfin des individus, des hommes"(95)

Fearful of the dangers to the individual posed by the collectivity, Guéhenno uses one of his last articles for Europe, the "Valeur d'une fête" of August 1935, to make individual self-interest the limit on collective action. Referring to the Left-wing demonstration in Paris on the 14th July 1935 he praises "cette foule d'hommes libres qui savaient n'être pas d'accord en tous points... mais qui... se donnaient la main... pour sauver la liberté que chacun doit à tous les autres"(96). This last reference to the "core" argument of Caliban parle, when taken in conjunction with the "Notes de lecture" as a whole, leads to the inescapable conclusion that Guéhenno's articles for Europe are a restatement of the ideas of L'Évangile éternel and Caliban parle.

The consideration of individual thought and reason in Caliban parle leads to a discussion of the wider problem of culture. The same is equally true of "Notes de lecture", while in Europe as a whole the importance of culture is emphasised in such articles as Gorki's "Avec qui êtes-vous "maîtres de la culture"?". In this article Gorki argues that "la culture n'est pas un besoin interne du monde capitaliste" and appeals to the cultural elite to draw appropriate conclusions: "vous intellectuels, "maîtres de la culture" vous devriez comprendre que la classe ouvrière, en prenant en main le pouvoir politique, ouvrirait devant vous les plus larges

possibilités de création culturelle"⁽⁹⁷⁾. Gorki's views parallel Guéhenno's own appeal to the cultural elite in Caliban parle, where he urges them to make culture relevant to the masses, but unlike Gorki, Guéhenno has little patience with socialist realist art. Guéhenno's early articles for Europe certainly present art as an individual and non-partisan problem. Describing the purpose of art in "La vie est un art" of June 1929 Guéhenno writes: "il s'agit de réconcilier tout homme avec soi-même"⁽⁹⁸⁾. Soon afterwards, referring to André Thérive's populist novel Le Charbon ardent in January 1930, he condemns the political bias of populist art: "Je regrette de discerner dans... ce mot "populisme" je ne sais quelle démagogie"⁽⁹⁹⁾. Guéhenno's early pleas for socially relevant art do not therefore extend to support for politically committed art, and this is why in "Notes de lecture" his position on artistic "engagement" is one of hesitance and uncertainty. It is true that in "Âme ma belle Âme" of November 1930 he criticises the works of Charles du Bos for their indifference to the real world: "rien mieux que de tels ouvrages... ne dénonce l'abîme qui sépare la pensée contemporaine de ce qui devrait être son objet, l'univers tragique où nous devons tenter de vivre"⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. Nevertheless Guéhenno is opposed to propagandist art and he makes this very clear in the article "Littérature prolétarienne" of December 1931 and January 1932. The aesthetic weaknesses of such books as Henry Poulaille's Le pain quotidien are abhorrent to him, hence his determination that "je déplore toujours qu'on revendique pour la littérature prolétarienne le droit d'être de la mauvaise littérature"⁽¹⁰¹⁾. Guéhenno is equally dismissive about the

resolutions concerning French literature, passed at the Kharkov conference. Kharkov for him shows only "l'esprit étroit de secte, le catéchisme marxiste", and the ignorance among Soviet writers of conditions in the West, where "l'individualisme est le premier et naturel recours des libres esprits"⁽¹⁰²⁾. Furthermore, in a veiled criticism of Soviet attitudes Guéhenno denies that a proletarian revolution can ever abolish the need for individual thought: "les plus grands écrivains seront encore obligés à ces retraits fécondes en eux-mêmes que recommande l'individualisme"⁽¹⁰³⁾. Guéhenno's own ideal is a literature which makes use of the essential similarities among men, but which retains a personal element and avoids the pitfalls of propaganda. His aim is to achieve social relevance without sacrificing the individual element in literature and this is possible if literature exploits the common "core" in Man. When this is successful, as it is in Luc Durtain's D'homme à homme, Guéhenno believes that by being himself the artist can speak for all men, realising "son profond désir... d'être l'univers lui-même"⁽¹⁰⁴⁾.

Because Guéhenno's primary concern is the individual human being, he is deeply affected by infringements of civil rights throughout the world and he uses his "Notes de lecture" as well as his position as editor, to defend victims of oppression. The first of many campaigns conducted by Europe in defence of civil liberties involved the German artist George Grosz. The case of Grosz, whose publication of a picture of Christ wearing a gas mask and army boots resulted in him facing criminal proceedings in Germany, attracted Guéhenno's sympathy because the victim was a pacifist. In January 1929 Europe published the offending picture

and in April the trial record appeared in the review⁽¹⁰⁵⁾.

The trial itself focussed on the question whether the words "Maul halten und weiter dienen" were intended to come from Christ or whether they were merely addressed to him. Nonetheless, for the artists and intellectuals who took an interest in the case the issue at stake was the much wider problem of artistic freedom as well as the right to criticism⁽¹⁰⁶⁾, and this is why Europe saw the trial as important.

The Mooney and Billings affair in the United States, the documents of which were published in Europe in November 1929, was a more serious abuse of the judicial system. At stake here was the continued incarceration of two men who had been framed by agents of employers, who wished to be rid of these syndicalist agitators. Henry T. Hunt, the author of Europe's dossier on the affair, calls for attention to it because it not only represents a case of injustice to two men, but also because it is a symbol of the class war: "Mooney et Billings sont encore... dans les prisons... parce qu'ils sont le symbole de la grande victoire remportée... par la puissance du capital sur la force d'agression des éléments syndicalistes"⁽¹⁰⁷⁾.

Persecuted pacifists could count on Europe's support throughout Guéhenno's editorship. Henri Guilbeaux's case resulted in a petition for him being published in the review in April 1929⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. When in October 1932 Guéhenno heard from Romain Rolland that Guilbeaux was in prison⁽¹⁰⁹⁾, he once more published a petition to which he gave his willing signature⁽¹¹⁰⁾. Both Guéhenno and Romain Rolland saw the case as involving the peace issue, so it is with a sense of triumph that Romain Rolland welcomes Guilbeaux's acquittal in

Europe in February 1933: "Quinze ans après (l' événement)...

l'armée et l'État sont contraints à avouer que le procès forgé contre (Guilbeaux) et contre nous tous, qui défendrons la paix ... que ce procès était forgé de mensonges"⁽¹¹¹⁾. André Marty

also received attention in Europe as a victim of the anti-anarchist laws of 1893-94. An organiser of the Black Sea mutiny on the Protet in 1919, Marty became a communist "député" in 1923, but his continued struggle against imperialist wars resulted once again in imprisonment in 1927 and 1928⁽¹¹²⁾. Marty was therefore entitled to Europe's support for three major reasons: as a victim of unjust, outdated legislation, as a pacifist, and as a defender of the Soviet Revolution.

Whereas Europe's early campaigns were not the direct responsibility of the editors, they rapidly became synonymous with Guéhenno's "Notes de lecture". Beginning with the case of the American anarchists Sacco and Vanzetti, he took direct control of the review's civil rights campaigns, becoming personally involved in the publication of the dead mens' letters. The French translation of these letters was undertaken by Guéhenno's wife in 1930⁽¹¹³⁾, but their publication posed such problems that Guéhenno appealed to Romain Rolland for help⁽¹¹⁴⁾. Many years after the event Guéhenno recalls that the complete edition of Sacco and Vanzetti's letters vanished mysteriously at the time of publication⁽¹¹⁵⁾, and in Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs he even accuses the American diplomatic services of responsibility for this act⁽¹¹⁶⁾. Regardless of the problems with the publishers however, Guéhenno included extracts of the Sacco and Vanzetti letters in the Europe issue of May 1930⁽¹¹⁷⁾. Documents from the trial appeared in the

November issue⁽¹¹⁸⁾ and Guéhenno's own assessment followed in March 1931. In "Deux hommes" he takes the view that Sacco and Vanzetti were found guilty not for what they did but for what they were: "ils étaient des Italiens, des ouvriers, des anarchistes ... Et ce fut là le "hasard" qui suffit à les rendre criminels aux yeux des juges américains"⁽¹¹⁹⁾. The case of Sacco and Vanzetti is therefore compared to that of Dreyfus: "La honte de l'affaire Dreyfus fut l'expiation de notre nationalisme. La honte de l'affaire Sacco et Vanzetti est l'expiation du nationalisme américain"⁽¹²⁰⁾. Guéhenno's next campaign involved the death sentences passed on sixty one Vietnamese rebels and took the form of an article for Europe, "Viêt-Nam", where Guéhenno describes his visit to the secretary of the colonies minister Paul Reynaud. The visit was less than successful but it convinced Guéhenno that "il n'est pas possible que cette politique de force et de prestige continue, qu'elle se recommande de nous"⁽¹²¹⁾. In "Viêt-Nam" he thanks the three hundred signatories of the petition which forced the ministry to receive him⁽¹²²⁾, a petition which Romain Rolland refused to sign. Romain Rolland's refusal was motivated by purely personal reasons: He would not sign an appeal written by Léon Werth⁽¹²³⁾. After the visit to the ministry, Guéhenno's next public act was to appear before a "conseil de guerre" as a defense witness in the court-martial of Jacques Martin, secretary of the Fédération des associations chrétiennes d'étudiants. In "Les sourds", written for the November 1932 issue of Europe, Guéhenno describes the events of the court-martial and praises the moral courage of Martin, "qui préférait une année d'emprisonnement à un asservissement de vingt et un jours qu'il jugeait indigne"⁽¹²⁴⁾. The injustices

of the institutions of the bourgeois state were not the sole focus of Guéhenno's attacks. He condemned injustice regardless of where it was practised, although it is fair to say that in the case of the Victor Serge affair his pleas were private rather than public. In September 1933 Guéhenno informed Jean-Richard Bloch that "je suis allé voir l'ambassadeur (de l'U.R.S.S.) avec Durtain"⁽¹²⁵⁾. Nonetheless he refrained from involving Europe in this campaign, mindful perhaps of the advice given by Romain Rolland. Writing to Guéhenno in October 1934 Romain Rolland makes his views perfectly clear: "aidons Serge, mais ne permettons pas qu'on se serve de lui contre l'U.R.S.S."⁽¹²⁶⁾.

Guéhenno's final campaign which involved a defence of civil rights was unlike the previous ones, because it involved sanctions applied against a group, rather than against one or two individuals. At the same time however, because the group under attack was the teaching profession, this was also the only campaign in which Guéhenno was defending his individual interests. In "Plaidoyer pour les instituteurs et les professeurs poursuivis" of March 1935 he condemns the attempt to reduce teachers to the role of propagandists of the State. Referring to disciplinary actions taken against Left-wing teachers, Guéhenno believes that "ce que la puissance publique poursuit en nous... c'est un état d'esprit qu'elle pense lui être défavorable et hostile"⁽¹²⁷⁾. His principle demand is autonomy for education and he draws on Condorcet's writings in this matter: "(l'indépendance du pouvoir social) est le seul moyen de s'assurer que l'instruction se règlera sur le progrès successif des lumières, et non sur l'intérêt des classes puissantes de la société"⁽¹²⁸⁾.

Like Condorcet, Guéhenno wants education to "(faire) de nos élèves des consciences toujours plus éclairées"⁽¹²⁹⁾. He therefore sees education as a means of achieving the spiritual improvement of the individual which he calls for in his major works. Consequently in order to preserve the ability of education to fulfill this role, he calls for it to be free of State pressure⁽¹³⁰⁾. Guéhenno's protests at State persecution of Left-wing teachers involved him in a campaign of intellectual protest in which Paul Nizan was particularly active. In "Notes-programme sur la philosophie" Nizan argues that orthodox philosophy of the type recommended by the school curriculum "sert à voiler les misères de ce temps... elle sert à mystifier les victimes de l'ordre bourgeois"⁽¹³¹⁾. He believes that the bourgeoisie is seeking to impose its cultural values on society in order to strengthen its rule. Consequently in "L'ennemi public No.1" he claims that Left-wing teachers have become a prime target, because "la bourgeoisie a entrepris une vaste opération contre les hommes qui, dans le pays, ont pour fonction de distribuer le savoir, de donner la culture"⁽¹³²⁾.

Although primarily interested in the human condition as it affects the individual, Guéhenno is also deeply concerned with the problems faced by the individual in his capacity as a social being. This concern is reflected in his desire that Europe should always be "au contact avec le monde"⁽¹³³⁾. In reality however, the interest in Man's social condition is focussed almost entirely on the U.S.S.R. and more particularly on the effort to change that condition, represented by the five-year plans. The general approach both in "Notes de lecture" and in Europe as a whole, seeks

to underline the psychological affect of the plans, there being little informed discussion of the economic problem. Guéhenno first revealed an interest in the plans in January 1931 when he wrote to Romain Rolland that "la réalisation du plan quinquennal me paraît de plus en plus être la grande, la seule question"⁽¹³⁴⁾. This is also the viewpoint of "À propos du "Plan Quinquennal"" , an article written by him for Europe in February 1931. This article begins with the qualification that "je ne suis pas un économiste", but in his enthusiasm Guéhenno does not hesitate to make sweeping statements on the Soviet successes⁽¹³⁵⁾. So great is his sense of awe, that he is even prepared to temporarily review his definition of revolution when he quotes Georges Soule's opinion that "la révolution matérialiste est la condition même de la révolution spirituelle à laquelle nous pensons"⁽¹³⁶⁾. Previously Guéhenno had understood revolution as signifying a process of self-improvement embarked upon by the individual. Guéhenno's own view of the Soviet experiment is further elaborated in Michel Farbman's first article for Europe which Guéhenno supplies with a commentary, describing it as "une admirable étude"⁽¹³⁷⁾. In "Le plan Russe" Farbman shares Guéhenno's optimism about the plan and claims that "la mécanisation de l'agriculture semble être acceptée par les paysans, comme ils ont aussi reconnu la nécessité d'associer leur travail"⁽¹³⁸⁾. Equally importantly he emphasises the non-material gains of the experiment: "à mon avis, le facteur essentiel est cette idée d'une vie nouvelle, qui a été éveillé dans les esprits"⁽¹³⁹⁾. Farbman's second article takes this last view a step further. In "La signification internationale du plan de cinq ans" he expects the

plan to be judged not only on its economic merits, but also as "une tentative héroïque pour transformer la nature humaine elle-même"(140). This second article looks forward to Guéhenno's "La nature humaine est-elle en train de changer en Russie?" of July 1933. In this article Guéhenno refers to Klaus Mehnert's evaluation of the plan, which is also his own:

"Quelle que soit l'importance de facteurs matériels, écrit excellemment Klaus Mehnert, ... ce n'est que si l'on réussit à créer un homme meilleur que le sacrifice n'aura pas été vain... J'ai le sentiment que les... russes gagnent tous les jours en dignité"(141).

Clearly therefore, after a period of initial over-enthusiasm Guéhenno succeeds in reconciling support for the plans with his own view of revolution, by concentrating on the psychological effects of the plans on human nature. His attitude invites a comparison with the conclusion of Malraux's La Condition Humaine. Here too industrial production is associated with a spiritual goal. When the survivors of the Chinese Revolution go to the U.S.S.R., Peï's final letter draws a comparison between the factory and a cathedral:

"Il faut que l'usine, qui n'est encore qu'une espèce d'église des catacombes, devienne ce que fut la cathédrale et que les hommes y voient, au lieu des dieux, la force humaine en lutte contre la Terre"(142).

The analogy clearly suggests that the factory, like the cathedral of old, aims to create a better Man. Nevertheless, although both Guéhenno and Farbman present the plans in a manner which diminishes the importance of the material attainment, they do accept them as an economic success and this in turn raises the problem of accuracy.

David Caute makes the general assertion that the Western intelligentsia as a whole was gullible to Soviet propaganda. Guéhenno, Gide and G.B. Shaw are among those he singles out for particular criticism⁽¹⁴³⁾. In Guéhenno's case susceptibility to propaganda is partly the result of the persistent efforts of Europe's communist contributors⁽¹⁴⁴⁾, but he also had personal reasons for welcoming the plans. As a man committed to rationality he could not ignore the appeal of a "scientific" planned economy, especially when confronted with the economic anarchy of the West⁽¹⁴⁵⁾.

Despite the fact that the plans made a strong and favourable impression on Guéhenno, his pro-Soviet sympathies never extended to a wholesale endorsement of the Soviet position. His reluctance to publish Soviet propaganda apart⁽¹⁴⁶⁾, he always ensured that Europe was open to all shades of Left-wing political opinion. In October 1930 he devoted his "Notes de lecture" to an article on Trotsky's *mémoires*, which did not endear him to orthodox communists. Guéhenno refused to take sides in the Trotsky-Stalin dispute, but his admiration for Trotsky is evident:

"nous avons peut-être mieux à faire que de devenir trotskiste ou antitrotskiste. En tout état de cause, ce sont de tels témoignages qui peuvent nous enseigner ce qu'est un vrai révolutionnaire"⁽¹⁴⁷⁾.

As if to emphasise Europe's independence on the Trotsky-Stalin issue, Guéhenno also published fragments of Trotsky's Histoire de la révolution russe in December 1932⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. His reluctance to submit to the Moscow viewpoint on Trotsky clearly prefigures the position taken by his friend André Malraux in the years following the publication of La Condition Humaine. At this time Jean Lacouture

claims that Malraux "se considérait... comme un sympathisant du grand proscrit"⁽¹⁴⁹⁾.

In reality the presentation of the U.S.S.R. in Europe is confused rather than one-sided, but this is to be expected in a review with no party political affiliations. Because there is no consensus, articles are published which present mutually conflicting viewpoints. Léon Pierre-Quint in his "Les caractères religieux du communisme" of July 1929, uses the arguments of former communist Max Eastman to attack Soviet society. He accuses the Soviets of having reduced dialectical materialism to the role of "la philosophie officielle... d'État de L'U.R.S.S."⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ and he ridicules the claims about a classless society. Pierre-Quint finds little to admire in the workers' state, convinced as he is, that "le communisme a une tendance naturelle à créer une hiérarchie bureaucratique"⁽¹⁵¹⁾. Quite the opposite attitude however is displayed by Prosper Alfaric in "La campagne anti-religieuse en Russie" of the following year. In this article Alfaric is full of praise for the Soviets and dismisses the allegations made against them as groundless. He quotes Serge - the deputy leader of the Orthodox Church, who dutifully declares that "il n'y a jamais eu de persécution de la religion en U.R.S.S."⁽¹⁵²⁾. Romain Rolland uses the opportunity of writing in Europe to present Lenin as a model revolutionary: "Lénine est tout entier, à tous instants de sa vie, dans le combat"⁽¹⁵³⁾. Nevertheless Europe also finds space for other more critical voices⁽¹⁵⁴⁾.

Guéhenno himself maintained an ambivalent attitude towards the Soviets and his private correspondence provides interesting comparisons with his articles on the plans. In September 1933

he informs Romain Rolland of his horror at "toutes les formes de l'enrégimentement, fût-ce la communiste"⁽¹⁵⁵⁾. Later, in May 1935 he expresses serious doubts about the Franco-Soviet pact: "le pacte franco-soviétique... m'a beaucoup inquiété"⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. Guéhenno's uncertainty about the Soviets does not affect his support for the plans, but it does have serious consequences for his attitude towards Marxist ideology. Guéhenno's presentation of Marxism is selective and often critical. In "En deçà de la Révolution" of July 1929 he returns to the vocabulary of Caliban parle when he describes H. de Man's arguments on the influence of Marxism on the masses, as "l'histoire de l'embourgeoisement de Caliban"⁽¹⁵⁷⁾. Although Guéhenno is not as hostile to the Marxist influence as de Man, he nevertheless accepts de Man's chief proposition: "La propagande marxiste en n'éveillant dans les masses... que la conscience de leurs intérêts, en excitant surtout leur "instinct acquisitif" les soumet à des préjugés bourgeois"⁽¹⁵⁸⁾. For Guéhenno this means that Marxism is an obstacle rather than an aid to the spiritual revolution which he desires.

Marxism remains a problem for Guéhenno throughout his time at Europe and this is reflected in his articles as well as in his editorial policies. In 1932 he proposed a special edition of Europe to be devoted to Marx. The proposal did not get very far, however, because there was a lack of interest in a project which was to be "au-dessus des partis"⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. At the same time the fact that there was little philosophical interest in Marx in France during this period meant that Guéhenno found it impossible to find appropriate articles for the special edition. Nonetheless

Guéhenno used the "Notes de lecture" to put forward his own view of Marx. In "Lawrence II" he is full of admiration for D.H. Lawrence and quotes his critique of Marxism with approval: "il nous faut une révolution, non pas au nom de l'argent ou du travail, mais au nom de la vie... le matérialisme desséché de Marx et des Soviets ne me semble pas mieux que ce que nous avons"⁽¹⁶⁰⁾. Guéhenno's own most substantial analysis of Marx, "En lisant Marx", concentrates on Marx's youthful philosophy, which he finds most compatible with his own: "Tout l'effort de Marx dans sa jeunesse est à se définir à lui-même l'homme"⁽¹⁶¹⁾. What Guéhenno finds most appealing in Marx is his description of alienation and the resulting call for a change in the cultural values of the proletariat. In this respect Guéhenno's ideas coincide with those of Marx:

"Mystifié à chaque moment de l'histoire par les idées dominantes de la classe dominante ... (l'homme) est comme aliéné de lui-même et perd la vie qu'il donne à ce qu'il crée, le capital, l'argent... Impossible de sauver l'homme réel tant qu'on n'aura pas reconnu et dénoncé ces illusions"⁽¹⁶²⁾

Although he accepts certain ideas put forward by Marx, Guéhenno is in no sense an orthodox Marxist. Indeed he has little time for those who see Marx as a God and this must by implication include the Soviets. Recalling the pre-unity days in "De Montaigne à Lénine" in May 1935, Guéhenno observes: "J'ai souvenir d'avoir été... assez malmené par tout ce qui se croyait marxiste-orthodoxe parce que je refusais de voir dans Marx un nouveau Christ"⁽¹⁶³⁾. In this article Guéhenno also integrates Marx into the humanist tradition:

"L'esprit de Socrate et de Montaigne et de Voltaire et de Goethe et l'esprit de Marx, de Jaurès et de Lénine sont le même esprit. L'histoire de la pensée humaniste n'est que l'histoire des efforts... pour retrouver la nature nue et vraie"(164)

This viewpoint also forms the basis of Guéhenno's speech to the Congrès international des Écrivains pour la Défense de la Culture, made on the 21st June 1935⁽¹⁶⁵⁾.

From the evidence of the "Notes de lecture" it is evident that Guéhenno takes a selective view of Marx and that he emphasises the early existentialist arguments⁽¹⁶⁶⁾, where Marx concerns himself with Man's cultural, spiritual values. His greatest admiration is reserved for Marx's voluntarist phase, during which in the Thesis on Feuerbach Marx called on philosophers to lead humanity: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it"⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. This statement can moreover be seen as an early call for intellectual "engagement". The affinity that Guéhenno feels with early Marx is perfectly understandable, because in this period Marx was also a supporter of the French Revolution and believed in total freedom⁽¹⁶⁸⁾. On the subject of Marx's mature philosophy however, Guéhenno like most fellow-travellers, found it impossible to accept historical determinism⁽¹⁶⁹⁾, although he shared Marx's view of the purpose of history. Marx claims that the goal of history is to make Man control history⁽¹⁷⁰⁾, and this is also the viewpoint of Caliban parle, where Guéhenno says that the meaning of history is to be found in revolution, by which he means that Man becomes the conscious controller of his own destiny. The argument is virtually identical to Marx's claim that the full development of human Being is only possible

if self-determination is attained, by a process of transcending determinism with the aid of rational thought⁽¹⁷¹⁾. The view that reason is a tool which helps Man to become a free and conscious being is also present in Caliban parle, although Guéhenno uses Renan's argument on the expulsion from Paradise, rather than that of Marx or Hegel.

With respect to the general presentation of Marxist thought in Europe, it is clear that Marxism is treated as an issue for debate and not as an authoritative doctrine. The juxtaposition of two conflicting opinions on Marx in the issue of May 1934 illustrates this point well. Max Eastman's article "Contre la dialectique Marxiste" dismisses the notion of historical determinism:

"(Marx) dotait son monde matériel d'une faculté de s'acheminer d'un pas nécessaire ... vers des fins idéales... la philosophie dialectique de Marx... est une survivance des constructions intellectuelles grâce à quoi des hommes, pour qui l'âme est tout, ont voulu sauvegarder dans le monde ces pensées où le désir se satisfait"(172).

Eastman's article is however followed by that of Herman Simpson, which defends Marx against Eastman's attacks. Simpson represents the position of integral orthodox Marxism and cannot therefore accept the destruction of a major Marxist idea. Consequently in rejecting historical determinism, Simpson believes that "Eastman rejette Marx en totalité"⁽¹⁷³⁾.

Guéhenno's interest in the U.S.S.R. stems from his belief that the Soviet regime is changing the human condition for the better by restructuring the economy and hence improving material conditions. Nevertheless the fact remains that his main concern

is the individual's spiritual life, so he is interested in the Plans only in as far as they can serve this goal. This rather narrow attitude towards collective action does not however serve as a barrier to his becoming involved in specific collective efforts. Indeed in Caliban parle Guéhenno makes it plain that since all individuals live in society and are basically alike, they can join together in a great many collective actions without needing to transcend their individual self-interest. In Europe the principal issue on which all individuals can unite is peace, and this is why so much space is devoted to it in "Notes de lecture" as well as in articles by other contributors. In an early article on the subject of peace, "Culture Européenne et Dénationalisation", of October 1929, Guéhenno remains true to his view of social behaviour when he openly identifies the peace issue with the self-interest of the individual. After first reminding his readers that "l'identité pathétique (de tous les hommes) est ancienne"⁽¹⁷⁴⁾, he makes the claim that peace unites the interests of the vast majority of men: "ce sont les plus humbles... qui ont fait la guerre, ce sont eux... qui feront la paix"⁽¹⁷⁵⁾. In "À propos d'une histoire de guerre" Guéhenno elaborates this argument and states that the choice between peace and war is made by every individual. Referring to the First World War, he quotes the view of Jean Galtier-Boissière, the editor of Le Crapouillot: "la guerre dura, comme elle avait éclaté, par la sottise de tous et la canaillerie de quelques-uns"⁽¹⁷⁶⁾. It is Guéhenno's firm belief that on the peace issue the individual viewpoint is not irrelevant. In "Vouloir la paix" of 1935 he criticises the generation of 1914 for not having demanded peace with sufficient

vigour. Moreover, he also makes it clear that when it comes to peace, there is no room for altruism. Guéhenno therefore rejects all thought of military intervention aimed at saving Germany from Nazism: "Entre la paix et l'Hitlérisme en Allemagne je choisis la paix"⁽¹⁷⁷⁾.

As well as representing Guéhenno's personal views on peace, Europe also tried to reflect a wide cross-section of pacifist opinion. This is why on Guéhenno's initiative⁽¹⁷⁸⁾ the issue of November 1934 was devoted entirely to a discussion of the peace problem and the First World War. The chief significance of this issue is that each contributor takes a different attitude to the problem, as only the articles of Alain and Giono support Guéhenno's views. Alain, like Guéhenno emphasises the importance of how the individual reacts to war. He accepts that men can be led, but adds that "l'esprit de guerre, celui qui donne l'impulsion finale, ne peut être qu'en nous"⁽¹⁷⁹⁾. Giono's contribution which Guéhenno describes as "un essai... d'une franchise de ton admirable"⁽¹⁸⁰⁾, contains arguments which are put forward in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans; a part of which appears in this issue. Giono, like Guéhenno, claims that "l'état capitaliste a besoin de guerre". Furthermore he states that "ce qui me dégoûte dans la guerre, c'est son imbécilité", and adds that he refused "de faire partie des sociétés d'anciens combattants"⁽¹⁸¹⁾. The belief that the First World War was a capitalist war and that capitalism is an enemy of peace is suggested by Charles Vildrac, whose article condemns the fact that the Alsace-Lorraine factories, "une richesse évaluée à huit milliards, ont été cédées... au Comité des Forges pour

la somme de cent quatre-vingt millions"⁽¹⁸²⁾. Vildrac's main argument however, challenges Alain's view that people accepted the war. His firm conviction is that "dès 1915... il n'y avait pas un homme... qui ne rêvait de vivre pour la Patrie, c'est-à-dire d'être rappelé à l'arrière"⁽¹⁸³⁾. This last statement is questioned by Eugène Dabit. His article contradicts Vildrac directly, because Dabit claims that during 1914-1918 "tous... acceptaient le destin en série qu'on leur avait fabriqué au 1 août"⁽¹⁸⁴⁾. An entirely different approach to the problem of war and peace is displayed in the article of Jean-Richard Bloch. Bloch, who wrote his article during a visit to the U.S.S.R., believes that "la question n'est pas de juger... nos actes de 1914, mais... de savoir ce qu'il faut faire pour en tirer toutes les conséquences". Since only the Russian people concluded the war with a revolution, his article praises Soviet society. The nature of Bloch's praise is significant because it demonstrates the close ideological affinity between himself and Guéhenno. Bloch like Guéhenno, admires the Soviets because "en ce monde-ci ... état, société, collectivisme, communisme, ne servent que de chemin à une dignité plus éminente de l'individu"⁽¹⁸⁵⁾.

Although Europe's special edition on war does not endorse any particular opinion, there is nonetheless general agreement that the First World War was a catastrophe that must not be allowed to recur . It is also worth noting that the lack of constructive proposals for peace in the special edition is not typical of Europe as a whole. In several of his best articles for the review, Guéhenno makes it very clear that peace is to be

achieved through the implementation of the European ideal, and he is supported in this view by Jules Romains. The European ideal as understood by Guéhenno envisages a politically united Europe⁽¹⁸⁶⁾. In an article of December 1929 "Sur une lettre à M. Andre Gide", he discusses the matter in some detail. Guéhenno understands Europe as an extension of the social ideal which he finds in Michelet, and which grounds collective behaviour in the common "core" shared by all individuals. The concept of Europe must therefore "s'asseoir ... sur le sentiment d'une toute humaine ressemblance". This philosophical argument is however balanced with an awareness of the political obstacles to a united Europe. Guéhenno realises the problem posed by patriotic sentiments and this is why he calls on his readers to fight "contre l'enseignement des histoires patriotiques". He shares Wells' view that "tous (ces) dangers de guerre... reposent sur l'étroite idée patriotique", adding: "Wells a bien raison de dire "le prix de la paix est l'abandon des idées de souverainetés indépendantes"⁽¹⁸⁷⁾. Herbert R. Lottman understands Guéhenno's position perfectly, when he states that "Europe se proclamait sans honte aucune internationaliste (et) pacifiste"⁽¹⁸⁸⁾.

The commitment to a united Europe is one which Guéhenno maintains in his articles throughout the early 1930 s. In September 1930 what he finds most significant in Keyserling is the fact that "Keyserling croit à l'unité de l'Europe, à l'existence de l'Européen"⁽¹⁸⁹⁾. Later that year Guéhenno minimises the importance of national differences, claiming that "l'Europe est actuellement notre vraie patrie. M. Daniel Halévy

... avait bien raison de m'accuser d'universalisme"⁽¹⁹⁰⁾. His perspective on events in Europe is also internationalist rather than patriotic. In "Le système de circonlocutions" on October 1932 Guéhenno states that a future war in Europe will have all the characteristics of a civil war, because: "ce ne sont pas des peuples qui se battent , mais des partis. Les nazis de l'Europe contre les socialistes de l'Europe"⁽¹⁹¹⁾. His analysis of German nationalism, "Le Nationalisme Allemand" of April 1933, also concerns itself with the implications for Europe. Regretting that Germany is persecuting her best sons, Guéhenno reminds his readers that "l'Europe que nous ferons ne peut être fondée que sur le droit commun"⁽¹⁹²⁾. It is important to realise that Guéhenno is convinced that a united Europe is a feasible proposition and not just a noble ideal. This he makes clear in "Réflexions sur l'Europe" of May 1933, when he challenges the views put forward in Julien Benda's "Discours à la nation européenne". Guéhenno calls for a practical teaching of the unity of European experience and criticises Benda's idealistic approach to Europe: "l'idée que M. Benda se fait de l'Europe paraît manquer de toute réalité"⁽¹⁹³⁾. A final indication of the importance of a united Europe to Guéhenno is provided by his response to the events of the 6th February 1934. This date marks a turning point in the ideas of many of the Left⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ and it is of critical importance to the history of the Front Populaire, as well as to the development of Vendredi. Guéhenno however, attaches little significance to the 6th February. Although the 6th February persuaded the Left to unite and encouraged many intellectuals to become politically committed, Guéhenno remained

largely indifferent until the formal inauguration of the Front Populaire in late 1935. His article of March 1934, entitled "Journal", pities the pathetic rioters of the 6th February and plays down the significance of fascist forces in France: "pour réelles qu'elles soient, je ne parviens pas... à les croire nombreuses"⁽¹⁹⁵⁾. In "À propos d'un plan et d'une méthode" of September 1934, Guéhenno dismisses the 6th February outright: "on n'est pas prêt à prendre pour la guerre civile une bagarre mal conduite"⁽¹⁹⁶⁾. He evidently did not share his friend André Chamson's obsession with the threat from the Right, which is later so forcefully expressed in Chamson's articles for Vendredi and his novel La Galère. What Guéhenno does suggest however, is that the 6th February is to be understood in terms of a general threat to Europe from the Right. His conclusion therefore is that "ce n'est pas la France qu'il faut sauver, mais l'Europe"⁽¹⁹⁷⁾.

The idea of a united Europe is presented primarily in "Notes de lecture" and does not receive general support as a practical proposal from other Europe writers. At the same time however, this idea is not an original contribution by Guéhenno. Indeed Guéhenno acknowledged his debt to Jules Romains for this idea, when he published "Pour que l'Europe soit" in Europe in April 1930. In this article written in 1915, Romains argues that the First World War is not unlike the American Civil War, because both wars have "le caractère essentiel d'être un conflit armé à l'intérieur d'une civilisation homogène"⁽¹⁹⁸⁾. This fundamental truth is nonetheless alien to the average European⁽¹⁹⁹⁾,

hence "le premier devoir sera d'organiser, dans tous les pays, dès le lendemain de la guerre... le parti européen"⁽²⁰⁰⁾. Since Guéhenno knew Romain Rolland personally and published his article, there are good grounds for supposing that Romain Rolland was a major influence on Guéhenno's "European" ideas.

Whereas Guéhenno's support for civil rights campaigns and his personal concern for peace in Europe are entirely compatible with his individualist philosophy, his involvement in Front organisations with wide social aims is more problematic. He certainly felt uneasy as a member of these organisations and until the mid 1930s preferred to remain on the sidelines. His early attitude is defined in a letter to Romain Rolland of August 1930, where he warns Romain Rolland against placing too much hope in the intellectuals' capacity for social action⁽²⁰¹⁾. Herbert R. Lottman is therefore overstating the case, when he presents Guéhenno as the father of "engagement" who first raised the problem in 1933⁽²⁰²⁾. Guéhenno himself in Carnets du vieil écrivain, claims that he only endorsed the limited definition of "engagement" given to him by Romain Rolland:

""Chacun, me répondit-il... doit tâcher de saisir la voix intérieure et, quand il est certain de l'avoir entendue, lui obéir. Mais où que vous entraîne la vôtre, gardez intacte votre indépendance..." C'est ainsi que je me suis toujours défini l'engagement"
(C.D.V.E. p.167).

This definition is important to Guéhenno, because it implies that "engagement" is a free individual act which does not involve any sacrifice of personal freedom.

The half-hearted attitude to "engagement" displayed by both Romain Rolland and Guéhenno in the early 1930s is clearly visible in their response to the anti-imperialist congress held in Amsterdam between the 27th and the 29th August 1932. The congress, which was in reality a communist Front organised by Willy Münzenberg⁽²⁰³⁾, did not benefit from the attendance of either of the two writers⁽²⁰⁴⁾, but ironically Romain Rolland wrote an account of it for Europe. This account presents the congress as "la plus puissante manifestation des masses de tous le pays contre l'impérialisme de tous les pays"⁽²⁰⁵⁾. Romain Rolland also regrets the boycott of the congress by the socialists and is at pains to underline its non-partisan nature. This is why he makes a point of listing the supporters of the congress: Duhamel, Gide, Vildrac, Bloch, Martin du Gard, Gandhi and Guéhenno⁽²⁰⁶⁾, although he does not make it clear what this support actually means.

Guéhenno's treatment of the Association des écrivains et artistes révolutionnaires (A.E.A.R.) provides further evidence for the argument that he was initially reluctant and cautious in his attitude towards "engagement". In December 1932 he informs Romain Rolland that he did not join this organisation, because in his view "la plus grande liberté est la condition de la plus grande action de écrivains"⁽²⁰⁷⁾. Despite this, in March 1933, he decided to attend a meeting of the A.E.A.R. in the company of Malraux⁽²⁰⁸⁾. Although the A.E.A.R. was a communist controlled Front and Guéhenno was not a member of it, he nonetheless joined Malraux, Dabit, Gide and Vaillant-Couturier at the table, from where he made a speech in favour of "engagement"⁽²⁰⁹⁾. Guéhenno's ties with the A.E.A.R.

are certainly ambiguous. There is doubt for instance, whether he was or was not a member of the "Comité d'honneur" of Commune⁽²¹⁰⁾, the journal of the A.E.A.R.⁽²¹¹⁾. Despite having doubts about actual membership, Guéhenno became a regular attender of writers' conferences. When in October 1934 a conference was held at the Palais de la Mutualité in Paris to report on the Soviet Writers Congress of that year⁽²¹²⁾, he was among those present⁽²¹³⁾. Ilya Ehrenbourg recalls that Vaillant-Couturier, Gide, Malraux, Andrée Viollis and ordinary working-class communists were among those who sat on the platform⁽²¹⁴⁾.

The Comité de vigilance des intellectuels anti-fascistes (C.V.I.A.-F.) was unlike previous organisations of this type, in that it was not founded by communists⁽²¹⁵⁾, but this fact had little influence on Guéhenno's attitude toward it, because his real objection was to the threat to his personal freedom posed by membership of any organisation. According to his own testimony the C.V.I.A.-F. "est sorti du bureau d'Europe", and the credit for it is given to Pierre Gerôme. From the beginning however, Guéhenno voiced serious doubts about the membership of this organisation. In a letter to Romain Rolland of March 1934 he questions the influence of communists in the anti-fascist movement, stating that anti-fascism should be dreyfusard rather than communist in character, and he gives communist penetration of the C.V.I.A.-F. as the reason why he refused to become its leader⁽²¹⁶⁾. His attitude therefore resembles that of Charles Péguy, who likewise objected to the political manipulation of a noble cause, during the Dreyfus Affair. Nevertheless Guéhenno

evidently had some degree of sympathy for the C.V.I.A.-F., since he allowed the publication of the Langevin-Rivet-Alain "Manifeste" which announced the creation of the organisation, as well as an article on the "Manifeste" by Pierre G  r  me⁽²¹⁷⁾. Although the association of Gu  henno with the C.V.I.A.-F. had little direct influence on Europe, it was to become extremely important during his years at Vendredi, when Vendredi often published the C.V.I.A.-F. viewpoint on the government's domestic and foreign policy.

Despite his longstanding involvement with intellectual Fronts, the single most important event which led many people to associate Gu  henno's name with intellectual "engagement" was undoubtedly the Congr  s International des   crivains pour la d  fense de la culture", held in Paris between the 21st and the 25th June 1935⁽²¹⁸⁾. According to Ehrenbourg the concept of an anti-fascist writers' movement including both French and Soviet writers, was first suggested at the conference held in October 1934, which reported on the Soviet Writers Congress. Lottman claims that this suggestion was then passed on to Moscow by Ehrenbourg, where it immediately attracted the attention of Stalin himself. Ehrenbourg therefore left Paris for Moscow in November 1934, and despite the fact that Moscow was at that time preoccupied with the Kirov murder, he was instructed to prepare a detailed plan concerning the establishment of an international organisation of writers⁽²¹⁹⁾. Upon returning to Paris he began to implement his plan with the help of Malraux, Benda, Waldo Frank, Guilloux, Gide, Bloch, Moussinac, Nizan, Ren   Blech and Chamson, all of whom attended

meetings at Ehrenbourg's flat⁽²²⁰⁾. Although Ehrenbourg does not mention them, Lottman believes that the list of participants also included Vaillant-Couturier, Guéhenno and Aragon - who was relieved of his duties at L'Humanité for the specific purpose of helping Ehrenbourg⁽²²¹⁾. The immediate goal of all these people was the preparation of a writers' congress⁽²²²⁾, but this was no easy task, because many writers were unwilling to attend an event which was rumoured to be a communist Front⁽²²³⁾.

A further problem, the consequences of which were more serious, involved Ehrenbourg's conflict with André Breton. The dispute between the two men began shortly before the congress was due to commence, when Breton hit Ehrenbourg during a chance meeting in a shop, because he was outraged by Ehrenbourg's book Duhamel, Gide, Malraux, Mauriac, Morand, Romain, Unamuno, vus par un écrivain d'U.R.S.S. Ehrenbourg's response to this assault, was to treat it as an insult to the Soviet delegation to the congress and to demand the exclusion of Breton from the proceedings. This action further enraged Breton, but more importantly it persuaded René Crevel of the need to reconcile the communists with the surrealists. Given Ehrenbourg's uncompromising position, Crevel's efforts were doomed to failure from the outset. Nevertheless for Crevel this experience was deeply disturbing and it upset his mental balance so much, that after returning home with Cassou and Tristan Tzara, he committed suicide later that evening⁽²²⁴⁾. The entire episode did little to ensure a smoothly-run congress. When on the fourth day of the congress Paul Eluard rose to read Breton's

speech, matters finally came to a boil. No semblance of ideological unity on the Soviet question was possible after this attack on the Soviets in both the political and the cultural spheres. Breton not only attacked the Franco-Soviet pact as a "carte blanche" signed by Russia in favour of French imperialism, but he also opposed "la collaboration culturelle entre la France et L'U.R.S.S."⁽²²⁵⁾. In fact the U.S.S.R. proved to be a contentious issue at the congress in several respects. Ill-feeling towards the Soviets was perhaps inevitable after the authorities refused to allow Gorki to attend the congress, particularly since this was an action which many interpreted as a snub: Lottman claims that "Malraux estimait que les Soviétiques se moquaient (du congrès)"⁽²²⁶⁾. In the event the most serious problem affecting the Soviets to be raised at the congress was the Victor Serge affair. Gaetano Salvemini first mentioned Serge on the 24th June drawing attention to "le traitement infligé par l'Union soviétique à Victor Serge"⁽²²⁷⁾. The following day the affair became a matter for general debate thanks to the efforts of Magdeleine Paz and Charles Plisnier. Ehrenbourg and Malraux did their best to limit the resulting publicity, but the suggestion made by Maria van Rysselberghe, that the congress was deliberately moved to a smaller venue for this very reason is open to debate⁽²²⁸⁾.

Despite all the difficulties which they faced both before the congress and later throughout its duration, the organisers achieved a notable success, because they persuaded a large number of internationally famous writers to take part. Not including

the organisers, French writers were represented by Barbusse, Benda, Emmanuel Mounier, Eluard⁽²²⁹⁾, Jean Cassou, Eduard Dujardin, Magdeleine Paz and Henri Poulaille⁽²³⁰⁾. At the same time the list of foreign writers was equally impressive: Heinrich Mann, Alexei Tolstoy, Aldous Huxley, Berthold Brecht, Isaac Babel, Nexö, Pasternak, Ernst Toller, Anna Seghers, E.M. Forster, Eugenio d'Piñ, Kerr, Max Brod, Shcherbakov, G. Tabidze, K. Michaëlis⁽²³¹⁾. John Strachey, Léon Feuchtwanger, Gaetano Salvemini and Robert Musil⁽²³²⁾, were all present at the congress. Throughout the five days of the congress a great many speeches were made on a variety of themes, but in his memoirs Ehrenbourg singles out five principal categories. These are anti-fascism, the role of the writer in society, the foundations of culture, common human values and the U.S.S.R.⁽²³³⁾.

With respect to Europe's presentation of the congress, emphasis is placed on the speeches of French writers and more particularly on those made by the review's chief collaborators. Both of Guéhenno's speeches are therefore published in full. His first speech, made on the evening of the 21st July, raises the problem of humanism, relating it to the aims of Soviet society. Guéhenno presents the U.S.S.R. as a country where human dignity is respected and adds: "la révolution russe n'est qu'un cas d'une immense... révolution humaniste"⁽²³⁴⁾. In his first speech he also refers to the "core" argument concerning the individual's relationship to others, but is careful to preserve the rights of the individual. With the Soviets in mind, he states: "je ne dis pas la volonté de ressemblance, je dis la volonté de communion"⁽²³⁵⁾. In his second speech made on

the 29th June, Guéhenno's whole attitude changes dramatically. Instead of praising the Soviets, he now criticises Lenin's contempt for democracy and culture by referring to a conversation which Lenin had with Trotsky, during their stay in London. Walking along the Thames, Lenin pointed to the Houses of Parliament and with the bourgeois nature of British democracy in mind, said: "C'est leur fameux Westminster"⁽²³⁶⁾. Guéhenno finds this statement wholly unacceptable and puts forward his own view that "le peuple au nom duquel nous parlons est tout... jeune encore... la culture c'est tout son désir"⁽²³⁷⁾. This reference to culture leads Guéhenno to restate the argument of Caliban parle, that the purpose of history is to make men conscious beings and that culture is the key to this process. His speech is in effect a synopsis of Caliban parle, so it is fitting that he should conclude it with his personal interpretation of revolution as a never-ending process: "une révolution faite, (l'esprit humain) en prépare une autre"⁽²³⁸⁾.

Although Guéhenno's second speech is important as an affirmation of the continuing validity of the arguments of Caliban parle, it is also significant as an example of his oral eloquence. As a teacher, Guéhenno was used to public speaking and according to Lucie Mazauric he enjoyed it, being gifted with an ease of expression equal to that of Malraux⁽²³⁹⁾. There are good grounds for supposing that the potential for public speaking is what attracted Guéhenno to the writers' conferences of the 1930 s. Whatever his early doubts about the advisability of intellectual "engagement", he always

welcomed an opportunity to speak. Simone de Beauvoir recalls that as early as 1929 he was addressing a public meeting, which was broken up by Action-Française thugs⁽²⁴⁰⁾. Guéhenno clearly enjoyed public speaking and he even developed a theory about it. In La Foi difficile he recalls that his aim in speaking was to persuade his listeners to associate themselves with him: "que personne ne vive plus que par vous, de vous" (F.D. p.160). This desire to make the world a part of him, rather than himself become a part of the world is typical of Guéhenno's individualistic viewpoint and it explains why his greatest fear was conformity.

Perhaps the most striking feature about the speeches selected for publication in Europe is the almost obligatory reference to the U.S.S.R. It is also apparent that such references are made irrespective of the theme under discussion. Jean-Richard Bloch's speech to the congress concerns itself with the problem of the writer and his public, a problem which Bloch poses in the simplest of terms: "le sort de l'artiste se confond avec le sort physique de la masse humaine". This statement is compatible with the aims of proletarian literature, but Bloch distances himself from an endorsement of Soviet socialist-realism: "une société communiste éprouve... plus vivement qu'aucune autre le besoin de la qualité"⁽²⁴¹⁾. André Chamson's speech also refers to the Soviet reality. He praises the transformation "qui se fait au nom de valeurs... qui s'appuient... directement sur l'homme et sur son labeur". Chamson contrasts this attitude with that of nationalism, which he believes is "opposé à toutes

les forces de la culture". Nevertheless like Guéhenno, he is anxious to preserve the autonomy of the individual, irrespective of the social system he finds himself in. His argument therefore bears a similarity to Guéhenno's "core": "Il y a des différences qui séparent les hommes... mais il y a des facteurs qui mènent directement à la communion"⁽²⁴²⁾. Georges Friedmann's speech concentrates on the conflict between mechanisation and spiritual values. It is Friedmann's view that "(la Machine) dégrade tous les valeurs spirituelles", although he paradoxically accepts the need for technical progress. His real target is industrialisation as such, but this does not prevent him from looking to the Soviets for hope. Even though Friedmann claims that the main problem is the mindless nature of the work on the production line, he also believes that this essentially boring work can take on a new meaning for the workers in a communist society. He therefore praises the U.S.S.R., because in Soviet society "le travail retrouve... une valeur morale"⁽²⁴³⁾. The spiritual concerns of Friedmann are challenged directly by Nizan's speech to the congress. Although like Friedmann, Nizan applauds the Soviets for improving the condition of Man, he nonetheless dismisses all spiritual problems. The humanist dream of "la perfection de l'homme" means little to Nizan, as "les revendications de l'humanisme ne signifiaient rien pour le plus grand nombre". His only interest is Man as he is, not as he should be. This being the case his attitude towards humanism is selective and expedient: "nous rejetons toute mythologie humaniste qui parle d'un homme abstrait"⁽²⁴⁴⁾.

The diversity displayed by the speakers whose speeches are published by Europe is so great that few conclusions can be drawn. This realisation is however significant in itself. The very fact that diverse and mutually conflicting opinions were expressed both at the congress, and later in Europe, shows that the congress did not wish to be seen as narrowly partisan, and neither did Europe. Nevertheless the significance of this tolerance is difficult to evaluate. Guéhenno, recalling the congress in later years, takes the view that the important communist organisers were more concerned with the fact that writers were present, than with what they had to say⁽²⁴⁵⁾.

Although the nature of the congress and its participants made the passing of all but the most general resolutions rather difficult, some important organisational decisions were taken. Chief among these was the creation of a permanent body, the Association internationale des écrivains pour la défense de la culture, with a base in Paris. This Association was to be led by an international bureau, mandated to hold annual meetings, and its programme was to carry out the following resolution: "lutter sur son propre terrain, qui est la culture, contre la guerre, le fascisme, d'une façon générale, contre toute menace affectant la civilisation"⁽²⁴⁶⁾. The praesidium of this new organisation included Gide, Barbusse, Romain Rolland, Henrich Mann, Thomas Mann, Gorki, Forster, Ramón de Valle Inclán, Aldous Huxley, George Bernard Shaw, Sinclair Lewis and Selma Lagerlöf, but its activities were to be supported by separate national secretariats. The French secretariat consisted of Malraux, Benda, Cassou, Chamson,

Giono, Lenormand and Guéhenno⁽²⁴⁷⁾, although the latter was not an active member. What is really significant about Guéhenno's presence in the secretariat is that it was a vote of confidence in him by the communists. This is because the congress was a communist Front and the international bureau was selected without any consultation of the delegates present⁽²⁴⁸⁾.

Whereas Guéhenno's involvement with the congress suggests that he wanted a more visible public role for himself, he nonetheless continued to play a dominant role in Europe, whose ideology reflected his personal viewpoint. He moreover used his position as editor to introduce the "Notes de lecture" in which he outlined his ideas on literature, philosophy and politics. Nevertheless it would be wrong to suggest that Europe was no more than Guéhenno's personal mouth-piece, because to do so would be to ignore the special contribution made to the review by Jean-Richard Bloch and Romain Rolland. The role played by these two writers is especially important, as both submitted material of an ideological and political nature.

Jean-Richard Bloch, six years Guéhenno's elder, trained as a historian, but soon decided to devote himself to literature, which was his real passion. His literary debut took place in 1912 with a short story about Jews entitled Lévy, and this was followed by the novels Et Cie of 1918 and La Nuit kurde of 1925 - a violent, tragic novel set in an exotic location⁽²⁴⁹⁾. Having fought and been wounded in the First World War, Bloch saw socialism as the logical outcome of war, but although he rejoiced at the news of the Russian Revolution, he was like Guéhenno more interested in Péguy and Jaurès than in Marx⁽²⁵⁰⁾. His primary concern was to

define the conditions of revolutionary culture, which he believed should be rooted in the popular soul⁽²⁵¹⁾. Such a view later endeared him to Guéhenno, during their period of collaboration on Europe, when their relationship was further strengthened by the common admiration for Romain Rolland⁽²⁵²⁾. Bloch's respect for Rolland is important because it explains why he became one of Rolland's earliest helpers on Europe. Being the former editor of L'Effort Libre, Bloch brought considerable and valued experience to the new review, which is why his complaints to Rolland of October 1923 led to the demotion of the directors Colin and Arcos⁽²⁵³⁾.

Bloch's most visible contribution to Europe were his monthly "Commentaires" which defined the review's ideological position until Guéhenno introduced his "Notes de lecture" in 1929. After this date the two features complemented each other. Guéhenno always considered the "Commentaires" to be a valuable part of Europe and privately he encouraged Bloch to continue them: "Tous les lecteurs d'Europe les attendent maintenant. Il faut bien que vous les aidiez à penser"⁽²⁵⁴⁾. His view, expressed in a letter to Bloch, was that "ce sont des articles réguliers de cette sorte qui donnent à la revue son aplomb, parce qu'une doctrine finit par s'en dégager"⁽²⁵⁵⁾. Guéhenno's attitude seems surprising, given that Bloch's articles competed with his own. In fact the high degree of agreement between the two writers made Guéhenno welcome Bloch's work as a confirmation of his own viewpoint. This is made clear in his letters to Bloch, especially in one of October 1931: "Je lis toujours avec bien de plaisir vos commentaires, plaisir fait d'un accord profond"⁽²⁵⁶⁾.

Of all the ideas which Bloch and Guéhenno have in common, the most important is the shared perspective on the individual. Bloch believes in the autonomy of the individual and emphasises the need for singularity. In "Du Symbolisme" of April 1930, he refers to the contemporary disillusion with the hypocritical material world, a disillusion which he claims "trahisse un... besoin... d'aristocratie, c'est à dire, devant le flot montant de la vulgarité, une... aspiration désespérée à la singularité, au refuge secret"⁽²⁵⁷⁾. Later, in "Objections de conscience" of November 1932, he emphasises that spiritual progress can only be made by the individual. He cannot therefore deny the schism which exists "entre le vouloir collectif de la tribu et les découvertes solitaires de l'esprit"⁽²⁵⁸⁾. Bloch's defence of the individual is not without consequence, because it obliges him to question certain aspects of the U.S.S.R. His article "Paganisation de la pensée contemporaine" of August 1929 attacks the quasi-religious mentality of Comintern leaders:

"ils se verraient accusées de transformer l'esprit révolutionnaire en une modalité extrême-gauche du fétichisme laïc. Par leur faute, le bolchévisme ferait culte avant de faire loi. Et ce culte s'adresserait à...Lénine"⁽²⁵⁹⁾.

Bloch's speech to the Soviet writers congress of August 1934, which he published as a "Commentaire", amounts to a dismissal of socialist realism and a defence of the writer's right to individual self-expression:

"Il est inévitable et nécessaire qu'il y ait des écrivains pour un million, ... et des écrivains pour cinq mille lecteurs. Quand une société est en train de réaliser la grande volonté socialiste... il lui incombe de veiller... à ce qu'il ne s'introduise pas, dans l'art de notions de masse"(260).

After such a clear statement it comes as no surprise to find Bloch criticising the Soviets for their aesthetic illiteracy. Among his impressions of Moscow in "Mort et résurrection de Moscou" of March 1935, he recalls the story of an old church, demolished to make way for the vulgar facades which express "la plus basse rhétorique du style 1880"(261).

Although initially an individualist, Bloch was always committed to the cause of the working masses. This is why in "De la Vulgarisation" of November 1931 he attacks the thinking elite for behaving like a priesthood and refusing to share their discoveries with the people. In the course of an argument that invites comparisons with Guéhenno's Caliban parle, Bloch supports the demands of the masses that scientists should explain their work to them. His aim is that science should serve all men, and this is why he claims that "la fin dernière de la science est la vulgarisation"(262). Bloch's commitment to the masses also explains why despite all his doubts, he felt obliged to support the Soviets. In "La Russie est-elle encore une patrie?" of November 1930, he defends the Soviets against potential foreign aggression in the strongest possible terms: "la défaite de la patrie russe... représenterait une défaite tragique de la civilisation... (la Russie) est bien davantage qu'une patrie. (Elle reprenne)

le rôle que la France a joué au XIX siècle"(263) A much fuller account of Bloch's conflicting views on the Soviet question is to be found in "L'Unité du monde" of March 1932. In this article he acknowledges that "Ils (les Soviets) nous proposent de renoncer à la liberté, au libéralisme, à la libre pensée". Nevertheless he also gives reasons which explain his attraction towards them: "pour prix de cette renonciation,... (ils) offrent le retour dans une vaste et puissante unité, - la fin de guerres par la fin des concurrences économiques et nationales"(264).

It is clear that in the early 1930 s the ideas and preoccupations of Bloch coincide to a surprising degree with the ideas and preoccupations of Guéhenno. Both are concerned with the problems of peace as well as culture, and even more significantly both are torn by the same conflict of individualism versus fidelity to the masses. The effects of this conflict are particularly important in respect of the attitude towards the U.S.S.R., but the wider question of revolution is also involved. It is no accident that Guéhenno and Bloch frequently discussed the latter subject and that Guéhenno once envisaged a long conversation on the matter. In June 1930 he wrote to Bloch that: "j'aurais plaisir à vous voir à Poitiers. Nous bavarderions longtemps ensemble... sur le concept de la Révolution"(265).

The amicable relationship between Bloch and Guéhenno came to an end in the wake of developments following the events of the 6th February 1934. The date marks the beginning of their parting, because Bloch, until that time a socialist, became increasingly pro-communist and eventually joined the P.C.F. after Munich(266).

He was therefore quite unlike Guéhenno , who grew increasingly hostile to communism throughout the 1930s, this hostility culminating in the famous denunciation of the Moscow Trials. The seriousness of the rift between Guéhenno and Bloch became very apparent in 1935, when philosophical disagreement aggravated the political differences between them. The former are particularly noticeable in a series of articles entitled "D'Érasme à Proust". In these articles Bloch traces the origins of modern Man to Napoleon and immediately associates modernity with individualism: "le caractère qui, dans le moderne l'emporte sur tous les autres est la prédominance du Moi, le règne aristocratique de l'individu"⁽²⁶⁷⁾. Later he states that "la société bourgeoise... (a) créé l'homme-centre ⁽²⁶⁸⁾, but paradoxically, in a capitalist system he believes that individualism leads to "un désert intérieur et... désespoir moral"⁽²⁶⁹⁾. In his conclusion of October 1935 Bloch finally announces the end of the individual; a concept which he earlier described as a bourgeois creation: "(l'homme-centre) commence à céder devant l'homme évolutif, tel que le dessine déjà une civilisation, - la soviétique"⁽²⁷⁰⁾. There is little doubt that by mid 1935 Bloch was not only a supporter of communist politics, but also an adherent to its ideology. His praise for Soviet Man, that is to say collective Man, suggests a dramatic total change from his earlier individualist position, and helps explain why he and Guéhenno had so little in common in their final months together⁽²⁷¹⁾.

Whereas Bloch's role in Europe was a very public one, that of Romain Rolland was less visible although it was more important.

As the founder of Europe Romain Rolland maintained a keen interest in the review during the Guéhenno years, a task which was facilitated by Guéhenno's attitude towards him. The key to understanding what was an essentially submissive attitude on the part of a normally independent man is without doubt Guéhenno's first reading of Au-dessus de la mêlée in 1915. As has been noted earlier, this condemnation of war in which he found confirmation as well as a justification of his own opinions, made a profound impression on Guéhenno and this in turn led to his treating Romain Rolland as a hero. His letter to him of June 1928 is very revealing in this respect: Guéhenno refers to "la joie profonde que j'avais de vous rencontrer", and recalls that "votre vie était pour moi un grand exemple"⁽²⁷²⁾. Since Guéhenno's relationship with Romain Rolland began on such a positive note, it is not surprising that he was willing to follow Rolland's example of intellectual political activity. In his tribute written for Rolland's 70th birthday, Guéhenno emphasises Rolland's influence on him: "c'est lui qui nous initiait à une vie héroïque, aux vrais combats, ceux de la paix"⁽²⁷³⁾. He furthermore compares Rolland's letters to those which Voltaire wrote from Ferney and presents him as an ideal artist who can express the problems of all mankind. It is clear however, that Guéhenno's perception of Rolland is idealised rather than real, as he himself states: "je voudrais parler de lui comme d'un personnage mythique"⁽²⁷⁴⁾. Nevertheless the view of Rolland as an ideal artist is interesting, because it shows that for Guéhenno, Rolland is a continuator of Michelet's ideal of "moi-humanité", which Guéhenno hailed earlier in L'Évangile éternel. Many years

later in his notes for the Sipriot radio programme Guéhenno recalls an expression of Rolland's which expresses his desire to be "moi-humanité": "là où bat plus fort le coeur du monde je sens battre plus fort le mien"⁽²⁷⁵⁾. The consequences of this hero-worship of Rolland are to be found not only in Guéhenno's own work, but most obviously in Europe, because as editor he allowed Rolland unlimited access at every level. The effect of this was to make Europe look like Rolland's personal mouthpiece and expose the review's contributors to Julien Benda's charge, made in the course of the already noted public argument with Guéhenno on the subject of culture, that Europe's collaborators were "les moutons de Romain Rolland"⁽²⁷⁶⁾. Surprisingly Guéhenno did not regard the remark as offensive. In his "Lettre ouverte à M.J. Benda" of February 1930, he answers Benda with the following words: "allons, nous voilà les "moutons de Romain Rolland"... Heureux ... qui n'a pas besoin de berger"⁽²⁷⁷⁾.

Although Rolland only met Guéhenno twice⁽²⁷⁸⁾ in the eight years during which the latter was associated with Europe, he nonetheless maintained close contact through the weekly letters which he sent from Villeneuve. Guéhenno welcomed these letters because they gave him courage⁽²⁷⁹⁾, but from Rolland's point of view they afforded him an informal opportunity to interfere in the running the review on a day-to-day basis. Some of his remarks certainly sound like directives. In January 1929 Rolland asked Guéhenno to ensure that Waldo Frank did not represent Bazalgette's friends in the special edition of Europe devoted to him⁽²⁸⁰⁾. Guéhenno agreed to respect these wishes. In

December 1929 Rolland requested that Elie Faure's article on Bourdelle should not be published, and again Guéhenno agreed⁽²⁸¹⁾. The following June, Rolland's request brought Europe's editorial independence into question, because he demanded a favourable review of his Goethe Musicien⁽²⁸²⁾, which was to be published in Europe in August 1930. In 1931 Guéhenno was faced with requests to institute a regular feature on revolution in the U.S.S.R. and in the world at large⁽²⁸³⁾, as well as with a plea to help Heinrich Mann⁽²⁸⁴⁾. He tried to placate Rolland by increasing the coverage of Soviet affairs and by mentioning the problems faced by intellectuals in Germany in his own "Le Nationalisme Allemand" of April 1933. On the basis of their published correspondence, it appears that Guéhenno only once openly refused a request from Rolland. This was in July 1933, when he refused to publish an article by Armand Colombat, which Rolland had wanted to see included in the review⁽²⁸⁵⁾. The incident is only of marginal interest however, because in March 1935 Guéhenno published Ervin Sinko's article on Hungary, in response to Rolland's request of January 1935⁽²⁸⁶⁾.

If Guéhenno's attitude towards Rolland appears sycophantic at first sight, it is as well to remember that when he responded to a request from Rolland, he did so in the knowledge that Rolland's ideas were also his own. On the fundamental issue of revolution, Rolland's letter to Guéhenno of August 1929 shows that they agreed that revolution was a never-ending process⁽²⁸⁷⁾. William T. Starr's reference to Rolland's letter to the Soviet Academy of Arts and Sciences of 1925, indicates that the agreement on revolution was even more profound. In this letter Rolland defines revolution as

a spiritual revolt against prejudice and injustice⁽²⁸⁸⁾, which means that both he and Guéhenno understood revolution as a spiritual process rather than as a political change. With respect to politics, both writers reacted scornfully towards political parties and refused to take sides after the Congrès de Tours of 1920⁽²⁸⁹⁾. In addition to the ideological similarities between them, biographical as well as psychological similarities also strengthened Rolland's relationship with Guéhenno. According to Starr's biography of Rolland, he and Guéhenno were not unlike each other. Rolland was a lonely self-centred child who loved to dream, but his need to assert himself meant that he broke with religion at an early stage, much to his mother's disappointment⁽²⁹⁰⁾. When he began studies at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris, it was as a student of history, but his real passion at this time was literature, so he became an admirer of Renan and Tolstoy⁽²⁹¹⁾. The affinity of ideas between Rolland and Guéhenno is however even more important than these biographical similarities which link the latter to the former: Rolland believed in reason⁽²⁹²⁾, supported the working masses while remaining sympathetic to France⁽²⁹³⁾, and very quickly became an arch-enemy of war⁽²⁹⁴⁾.

Given this degree of agreement, it is hardly surprising that Guéhenno welcomed Rolland's suggestions, especially since they were often of great practical help. He is entirely truthful in Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs, when he claims that "je n'aurais jamais sans (la correspondance avec Romain Rolland), pu faire la revue Europe pendant les six années que je la

dirigeai" (D.L.D.P. p.48). The evidence of the correspondence certainly substantiates Guéhenno's claim. Rolland's main areas of contribution were help in finding new contributors for Europe, help in finding articles, frequent gifts of his own work and total responsibility for the review's presentation of Indian affairs.

The introduction of new talent to Europe was perhaps Rolland's least significant contribution, because only three writers received his recommendation. Of these the first was Louis Laloy, whom Rolland presented as an acquaintance of Sun Yat Sen⁽²⁹⁵⁾. Louis Laloy later wrote an article about his friend for Europe, which Guéhenno received⁽²⁹⁶⁾ but did not publish, preferring instead Laloy's article "Goethe et Beethoven"⁽²⁹⁷⁾. Rolland's appeal for Aragon in a letter of November 1932 was less successful, since Guéhenno joined the list of people who refused to publish the articles referred to by Rolland⁽²⁹⁸⁾. Rolland had no more luck with Pierre Ganivet who wrote important work on the German economy. His advice to use Ganivet in Europe was not heeded⁽²⁹⁹⁾, although there is no evidence that Guéhenno was to blame in this particular case.

Of the material submitted to Europe by Rolland, the vast majority is made up of his own work. He did present the review with an Appeal for Ukrainians in Poland, the Ruegg appeal to the Chinese ambassador and Birukoff's letters to Tolstoy⁽³⁰⁰⁾, but these are the only exceptions to the rule. Frequently encouraged by Guéhenno⁽³⁰¹⁾, Rolland became a major contributor to Europe, although he himself realised that this constant use of his name

was harming the review's reputation⁽³⁰²⁾. Nevertheless despite these private doubts and the resolve not to write for Europe in the wake of André Thérive's published attack on him⁽³⁰³⁾, Rolland continued his collaboration. In March 1933 he offered Guéhenno fragments of his fictional work, in particular L'Âme Enchantée⁽³⁰⁴⁾, which appeared as "Les Cinq" in January 1933 and as "L'Individualiste aux abois" in October 1933⁽³⁰⁵⁾. His most important contribution however, was as Europe's presenter of Indian affairs.

The fact that Romain Rolland had a total monopoly on the presentation of India, means that in this respect Europe represents what is essentially his private position, even though this position had Guéhenno's support. The series of articles on India began in early 1929 with "Un grand mystique indien: Ramakrishna" and "Un héros de l'Inde Nouvelle: Vivekananda"⁽³⁰⁶⁾, where in the course of a discussion of the Indian philosophers, Rolland expresses his own ambitions. What he finds most appealing in Vivekananda is the desire to join "la raison à l'intuition, l'activité sociale à la méditation"⁽³⁰⁷⁾. He is therefore looking for confirmation of his own need for freedom and spiritual progress, which Starr regards as all-important to him⁽³⁰⁸⁾. This early interest in Indian philosophy is however soon overtaken by a preoccupation with political developments, to which "Le Réveil National de l'Inde et les Réveilleurs" of November 1929 bears witness⁽³⁰⁹⁾. As a result of this change Rolland's articles for Europe took on a political significance and his private letters urged Guéhenno to adopt

a similar view. In June 1930 he asked Guéhenno to publish Rabindranath Tagore's article on India whilst at the same time advising him to read Gandhi's weekly newspaper Young India⁽³¹⁰⁾. Guéhenno naturally obliged his friend, with the result that Tagore's "Message à l'Angleterre" and Gandhi's "Lettre au vice-roi des Indes" appeared in Europe in July 1930⁽³¹¹⁾. The figure of Gandhi is of great importance to Rolland's view of India, which is why Gandhi increasingly comes to dominate his articles in the early 1930 s. In April 1931 he gave Europe his preface to Gandhi's autobiography, where he presents Gandhi as "le Christ indien" for whom truth "est sa raison de vivre"⁽³¹²⁾. A year later, in September 1932 he gave Gandhi's unpublished letters to the British government⁽³¹³⁾, which Guéhenno included in the October and November editions⁽³¹⁴⁾. Gandhi's political appeal clearly inspired Rolland, because in his account of the Amsterdam Congress, he refers to him as to "le plus pur héros de l'action sociale"⁽³¹⁵⁾. Despite the extensive coverage of India which Guéhenno permitted, Rolland could never be satisfied with its scope⁽³¹⁶⁾, given his keen interest in the subject⁽³¹⁷⁾. He therefore sent Guéhenno every document on India which came his way, and urged him to take a strongly anti-British line⁽³¹⁸⁾. Although Rolland originally admired Guéhenno for his non-partisan stance, he now actively encouraged him to politicise Europe, by praising the fact that "toute la partie politique d'Europe prend de plus en plus d'intérêt"⁽³¹⁹⁾. His private letters certainly left little doubt that he wanted the review to support specific political

demands made by Indian nationalists. As early as in May 1930 he wrote to Guéhenno with a request that Europe should demand Dominion status for India⁽³²⁰⁾, and in April 1931 he urged him to give full support to Gandhi, despite the widespread opinion in all political circles, that Gandhi did not have the support of radical Indians⁽³²¹⁾. Rolland's admiration for Gandhi very quickly affected Guéhenno, who adopted his master's opinions on the matter. On hearing of Gandhi's arrest in May 1930, he immediately wrote to Rolland, asking him to write some kind of protest⁽³²²⁾. The following year he again mentioned Gandhi in his correspondence. Using words which recalled Rolland's own view of Gandhi, he referred to him as the saint in politics and expressed a desire to meet him⁽³²³⁾. Guéhenno's idealised view of Gandhi which he received from Rolland is nevertheless controversial. Zareer Masani believes that Gandhi consciously encouraged the associations made between himself and Christ "in the course of his flirtations with Christianity and his close links with British Anglicans, Quakers... vegetarians and pacifists"⁽³²⁴⁾. Furthermore Masani interprets Gandhi's frequent "fasts unto death" as cynical attempts to threaten the Raj with mass-violence, and presents him as a conservative middle-class figure. In Masani's view:

"(Gandhi's) concept of trusteeship recognised feudal landlords, big business and even the princes as legitimate trustees of the nation's wealth... His own campaigns on behalf of the under-privileged were not directed against their Indian oppressors, only against British capitalists and landlords"⁽³²⁵⁾.

It is somewhat ironic that when despite a very close relationship Guéhenno and Rolland finally parted company, their argument centred on the issues which originally united them. There is little doubt that disagreement over the policies to pursue on peace and conflicting attitudes towards the editorial freedom of Europe led directly to their separation, which in turn led to Guéhenno leaving the review. The lack of unity on the peace issue is easily demonstrated by an exchange of letters of early 1936, when Guéhenno challenges Rolland's assertion that France was not provoking war⁽³²⁶⁾, with the view that France was entirely responsible for the failure of disarmament talks⁽³²⁷⁾. The dispute over Europe's editorial freedom is however more complex, because it basically involved two battles with two quite different enemies, in the course of which Rolland abandoned Guéhenno by not affording him the necessary support. Guéhenno's struggle to retain control of the review began in December 1934 in the wake of a financial crisis affecting the publishing house of Rieder⁽³²⁸⁾. Seven months later he complained to Rolland that Rieder was not paying the staff⁽³²⁹⁾, but the complaint fell on deaf ears, so when Rieder announced a reduction in funds for Europe the following January, Guéhenno decided that he could no longer continue as editor⁽³³⁰⁾. Almost immediately however, Rieder abandoned the rationalisation plan in favour of a rapid sale of the review. The decision completely changed the nature of Guéhenno's problem, since the issue now was whether the review could preserve its independence vis à vis future owners. At first he had the support of Rolland, who was concerned that no single party should exploit his name in Europe⁽³³¹⁾, but

this support evaporated and the Amis d'Europe bought the review for the communists. In La Foi difficile Guéhenno recalls how he learnt of the sale of the review from a friend, who informed him that the Amis d'Europe wished to retain his services, but only on the condition that he succumbed to their wishes⁽³³²⁾. Mme. Annie Guéhenno confirms this story, and adds that the friend concerned - Jean-Richard Bloch, showed her husband a list of the members of the Amis d'Europe, which made it immediately obvious that this was a communist take-over. Guéhenno then stood up, dismissed Bloch's comment "nous sommes libres" with a curt "j'ai toujours été un homme libre", and left the review for good⁽³³³⁾. The new communist owners of Europe did not try to change his mind. In his notes for the Sipriot radio programme Guéhenno therefore blamed the old and the new proprietors, as well as the supporters of the latter for forcing him to leave:

"Des circonstances tout a`fait indépendantes de ma volonté m'ont contraint à quitter la direction d'Europe... La conjonction d'une intrigue politique à l'intérieur de notre équipe... et des intérêts financiers me contraignirent à partir"(334).

Profiting from the fact that under the terms of the sale the Amis d'Europe were to have no influence on the review until the May edition⁽³³⁵⁾, Rolland made a belated effort to persuade Guéhenno to stay on as editor, in a letter of March 1936⁽³³⁶⁾. Guéhenno replied to this letter, but made it clear that he would not return to Europe: "je ne m'y sentirais plus libre"⁽³³⁷⁾. In a second letter of April 1936 he expressed his regret at what had happened over the past eight months. He himself had little

doubt that although Rieder first forced him out of Europe, it was his friends who finally obliged him to leave⁽³³⁸⁾. Rolland evidently realised that the latter included himself, because he did not reply to Guéhenno's letter, which is why there is a year-long break in their correspondence.

Regardless of his attitude to Guéhenno's departure, Rolland retained his close interest in Europe throughout the following three years. These were years which saw changes among the review's collaborators, and to a certain extent in its political opinions. With the departure of Guéhenno and Prévost, Guilloux, Giono, Chamson and Alain could no longer find space in Europe. Their place was taken by the work of P.-J. Jouve, Paul Eluard, Tristan Tzara, Pasternak, A. Bloch, Neruda, Aragon, Martin du Gard, Montherlant, Nizan, Faulkner and Thomas Mann⁽³³⁹⁾. Nevertheless it should be realised that most of the writers in the latter category had also been welcome collaborators during Guéhenno's editorship. In terms of policy Europe under its new editor Jean Cassou⁽³⁴⁰⁾ adopted an anti-appeasement viewpoint. It attacked non-intervention in Spain, opposed abandoning Czechoslovakia and maintained a strongly anti-fascist profile⁽³⁴¹⁾. There are adequate grounds for supposing that these policies would have had Guéhenno's support. Although he himself took a more extreme pacifist view, rejecting André Chamson's criticism of non-intervention in Spain⁽³⁴²⁾, Vendredi, the paper of which he was a director and policy-maker in the mid 1930's, supported the same ideas as did Europe. The crisis which finally destroyed the review came about as a result of

the Nazi-Soviet pact, made public on the 23rd August 1939. The Soviet action shocked Europe's collaborators and split them into two hostile camps. Faced with Lalou and Durtain's demands for a condemnation of the Pact, as well as with Aragon and Bloch's wish to support it, Rolland felt he had little option but to suspend publication of the review⁽³⁴³⁾.

Guéhenno's association with Europe spanned such a long time, that the importance of events affecting his personal life during this period is easily overlooked. The early 1930's were in fact a very busy period for him, especially since he combined his work as editor with a career in teaching and writing. After two years at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, he took up the post of Professeur de Première Supérieure at the Lycée Lakanal in the autumn of 1929 and remained there until 1939⁽³⁴⁴⁾. The move to this new post also obliged him to find new accommodation, hence in the autumn of 1929 he became a tenant of Jules Romain, renting a garden pavillion in the writer's house at 9 rue des Lilas in Belleville⁽³⁴⁵⁾. As well as his Lycée teaching however, Guéhenno also lectured twice a week at the École Normale Supérieure d'Enseignement Technique. This part-time post was of great importance to him, because it allowed him to experiment with the syllabus. In a letter to Rolland written in May 1933 he mentions that he only accepted the lectures "à la condition d'être tout à fait mon maître d'enseigner sans programme"⁽³⁴⁶⁾. That Guéhenno was able to impose such a condition was a tribute to his considerable lecturing abilities. He certainly made the most of his opportunities, visiting Germany on lecture tours in July 1930⁽³⁴⁷⁾ and May 1931⁽³⁴⁸⁾, and Holland in February 1935⁽³⁴⁹⁾. Regrettably this professional success was

overshadowed by personal tragedy. Guéhenno's mother died in September 1931⁽³⁵⁰⁾ and his wife Jeanne in April 1933⁽³⁵¹⁾, after a long illness.

Guéhenno's experience on Europe is important because it serves to reinforce opinions about him, made earlier with respect to his pre-war life and his first three published works. As the editor of Europe Guéhenno was still an individualist, hence he found his work difficult in the early years, when he was a part of a team. Furthermore he consciously used Europe as his personal mouthpiece, stamping his authority on the review through his regular editorials, the "Notes de lecture". Although it is true that Jean-Richard Bloch and Romain Rolland had a great deal of influence on Europe during Guéhenno's editorship, it is as well to remember that these two writers shared the editor's viewpoint in the years when they worked together. Guéhenno's basically individualist outlook is also seen in his passionate defence of civil liberties in the face of threats from both the Right and the Left. In terms of ideas, Guéhenno's work on Europe, especially his "Notes de Lecture", continues and develops the themes as well as the viewpoints of L'Évangile éternel, Caliban parle and Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. These editorials represent a practical confrontation of his ideas on philosophy, individualism, culture and peace, with the ideas of other authors, which is why they are an important counterpart to his major published works.

Nevertheless Guéhenno's analysis of the human condition, which is the chief area of interest of Europe, shows that he is now

concerned not only with the problems facing an individual, but also with Man's social Being. This is especially evident in his presentation of the U.S.S.R. as a country striving to achieve dignity for the individual by affecting changes in the social structure. It is also seen in Guéhenno's increasing involvement with intellectual "engagement", particularly in the anti-war Front organisations. This is not to say that he was already fully committed to political "engagement". In fact Guéhenno still refused to join any organisation, even though he welcomed the opportunity they afforded him to express his views in public.

Despite the fact that Europe was the first review which he edited single-handedly, Guéhenno improved it considerably, largely as a result of his personal initiatives. He succeeded in increasing the review's popularity and equally importantly he solved the problem of the unwillingness of French writers to contribute to it, when he made Europe international in scope, by introducing translations.

It was because Guéhenno did so much for Europe that he found the threat to his editorial freedom in 1936 intolerable, and regarded it as a personal insult. Rather than watch his review become transformed into a vehicle for communist propaganda, he therefore preferred to hand in his resignation. Being simultaneously a co-director of Vendredi, he decided to concentrate his efforts on this potentially much more influential weekly of the Front Populaire, where he was destined to play a very significant role.

Footnotes to Chapter Five

1. Letter from Romain Rolland to Rabindranath Tagore. Quoted in Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe. Prague, Statni Pedagogicke nakladatelstvi, 1971. p.86.
2. For information on this matter, see: Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, pp.86-87.
3. See: Lucie Mazaure avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.165.
4. See: Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, pp. 88-89.
5. See: *ibid.*, pp.91-92.
6. See: F.D. pp.108-109.
7. See: Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.95.
8. Guéhenno refers to Bazalgette's death and funeral in a letter to Romain Rolland of the 1st January 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.42.
9. From the unpublished notes on Europe prepared by Jean Guéhenno for a radio programme with P. Sipriot in 1975, p.1. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). This fact is also confirmed in F.D. p.109.
10. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 12th November 1928 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.31.
11. From a letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 22nd November 1932 in *ibid.*, p.236.
12. From a letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 25th March 1934 in *ibid.*, p.297.
13. See: Daniel Halévy, Péguy et les Cahiers de la Quinzaine, pp.47 and 112.
14. For the information that Péguy was a "boursier", see: *ibid.*, p.25.

15. For the information that Péguy attended the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, see:
ibid., p.25.
16. For the information that Péguy attended the École Normale Supérieure, see: ibid., p.42.
17. Péguy, in his "Compte rendu d'un Congrès socialiste" 1900, says: "Dire la vérité, toute la vérité... voilà ce que nous nous sommes proposé". Quoted in ibid., p.87.
18. Péguy printed this on the verso of each issue of the Cahiers de la Quinzaine. This is mentioned in ibid., p.91.
19. See: L.M.D.A. p.50.
20. See: William Thomas Starr, Romain Rolland: One Against All. A Biography. The Hague, Mouton, 1971, p.111.
21. Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe. p.86.
22. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 5th November 1928 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.30.
23. From a letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 18th March 1929 in ibid., p.58.
24. From a letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 20th August 1929 in ibid., p.68.
25. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 1st November 1928 in ibid., p.29.
26. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 12th November 1928 in ibid., p.32.
27. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 3rd February 1929 in ibid., p.50.

28. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 25th November 1928 in ibid., p.37.
29. This information is given by Jean Guéhenno in the unpublished notes on Europe prepared by him for a radio programme with P. Sipriot in 1975, p.1. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
30. For the information that No's 73-76 of Europe were compiled jointly by Jean Guéhenno and Léon Bazalgette, see the inside cover of Europe, avril 1929.
31. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 20th May 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.61.
32. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 26th May 1929 in ibid., p.64.
33. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 21st October 1929 in ibid., p.74. See also: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 5th March 1930 in ibid., p.89. See also: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 2nd September 1930 in ibid., p.121.
34. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 2nd August 1931 in ibid., p.165.
35. From a letter from Romain Rolland to R. Arcos of the 6th March 1929. Quoted in Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.95.
36. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 3rd December 1931 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.184.
37. See: Europe, avril 1929, front cover.
38. See: Europe, août 1929 - décembre 1932, front covers.

39. See: Europe, janvier 1932, front cover, See also: Europe, septembre 1932, front cover.
40. See Europe, septembre 1932, front cover.
41. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 5th July 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.65.
43. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 18th September 1930 in ibid., pp.127 and 129.
44. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 23rd September 1932 in ibid., p.218.
45. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 31st October 1932 in ibid., p.221.
46. This is Romain Rolland's view of November 1930, quoted in Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.96.
47. This is the opinion expressed in Romain Rolland's letter to Martinet of 1932. Quoted in ibid., p.99.
48. From a letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 22nd November 1932 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.236
49. From the unpublished notes on Europe prepared by Jean Guéhenno for a radio programme with P. Sipriot in 1975, p.4. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
50. See F.D. p.156.
51. See: ibid., p.127.
52. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.55. See also: Europe, janvier 1935, front cover, for the information that Europe had moved to 108 Bld. Saint Germain.

53. Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.55
54. See F.D. p.129.
55. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 30th July 1935 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.346.
56. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 12th November 1930 in ibid., p.135.
57. In an unpublished letter of the 2nd January 1933, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.R. Bloch, Guéhenno informs Bloch that "les derniers No's d'Europe ont été tirées à 4,900 exemplaires".
58. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 30th July 1935 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.346.
59. See: F.D. p.112.
60. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 12th November 1930 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.136.
61. From the unpublished notes on Europe prepared by Jean Guéhenno for a radio programme with P. Siprior in 1975, p.4. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). The list of Guéhenno's recruits to Europe is also confirmed by him in F.D. p.110.
62. See: Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.97.
63. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 24th August 1933 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.277.
64. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 6th September 1930 in ibid., p.123.
65. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 18th September 1930 in ibid., p.127.

66. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 23rd December 1929 in *ibid.*, p.79.
67. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 22nd October 1931 in *ibid.*, p.174.
68. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 18th September 1930 in *ibid.*, pp. 128-129.
69. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 24th September 1930 in *ibid.*, p.130.
70. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 2nd August 1931 in *ibid.*, p.165.
71. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 31st August 1931 in *ibid.*, pp.172-173.
72. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 4th August 1932 in *ibid.*, p.210.
73. See: Letter from Jean Guehenno to Romain Rolland of the 30th November 1931 in *ibid.*, pp.182-183.
74. Herbert R. Lottman, in his La Rive gauche, p.138, states:
"À première vue, le mensuel Europe a parfois pu paraître superflu... un examen plus attentif... montrait cependant que cette revue... était tout ce que la N.R.F. ne pouvait être".
75. *Ibid.*, p.138.
76. Paul Nizan's Aden Arabie appeared in Europe, septembre 1930, pp. 1-24, octobre 1930, pp. 196-224, novembre 1930, pp. 362-399. His Antoine Bloyé appeared in Europe, juin 1933, pp.250-273, juillet 1933, pp.337-427, août 1933, pp.555-581, septembre 1933, pp.83-116, octobre 1933, pp. 222-261. Romain Rolland's L'Âme Enchantée•

appeared in Europe as "Les Cinq" in Europe, janvier 1933, pp.5-32,
and as "L'individualiste aux abois" in octobre 1933, pp.153-174.

77. This was confirmed in conversation with the author by
Mme. Annie Guéhenno on the 14th May 1984.
78. For information on Europe's readers, see: F.D. pp.112-113.
79. Paul Nizan, "Une littérature responsable", Vendredi, No.1.
7 novembre 1935, p.4. What Nizan is implying in the context
of this article is that Europe had few subscribers and that the
majority of them came from the teaching profession.
80. This is the view of Romain Rolland quoted in Joseph Kvapil,
Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.95.
81. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La Condition humaine", Europe,
juin 1933, pp.282-288. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno,
Entre le passé et l'avenir. Paris, Grasset, 1979. p.209.
82. André Malraux, La Condition humaine, Quoted in ibid., p.206.
83. For the information that Guéhenno wished to write book reviews,
see: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 1st
January 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.42.
84. Pascal Ory, Introduction to Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et
l'avenir, p.9.
85. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Benjamin Constant", Europe,
janvier 1931, pp. 103-107. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno,
Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.91.
86. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La montagne magique",
Europe, novembre 1931, pp.424-430.

87. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 15th September 1933 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.279.
88. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Décadence de la vertu", Europe, février 1935, pp.261-271. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, pp.268-269.
89. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le message de Lawrence d'après sa correspondance", Europe, mai 1934, pp. 108-114. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.217.
90. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos de Descartes", Europe, mai 1931, pp. 124-128. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.115.
91. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Les paroles restent", Europe, juillet 1931, pp.416-420. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.126.
92. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture, Le Dernier Sage", Europe, décembre 1935, p.554.
93. Guéhenno praises Henry David Thoreau for saying: "sachez que vous êtes seul dans le monde" in his "Notes de lecture, Les réfractaires", Europe, mai 1930, pp.100-105. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.38. Guéhenno also comments on the theme of solitude, saying, "nous sommes seuls, d'une solitude que rien ne peut guérir". Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La Condition humaine", Europe, juin 1933, pp. 282-288. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.205.
94. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture, Jaurès ou la révolution rationnelle", Europe, novembre 1933, pp.426-427.

95. Ibid., pp.426-427.
96. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Valeur d'une fête", Europe, août 1935, pp.601-605. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.273.
97. M. Gorki, "Avec qui êtes-vous, maîtres de la culture?", Europe, juin 1932, p.225 and pp. 241-242.
98. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La vie est un art", Europe, juin 1929, p.210.
99. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le secret", Europe, janvier 1930, p.115.
100. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Âme ma belle âme", Europe, novembre 1930, p.406.
101. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Littérature prolétarienne", Europe, décembre 1931, p.570.
102. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Littérature prolétarienne II", Europe, janvier 1932, pp. 111-113.
103. Ibid., p.116.
104. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. D'homme à homme", Europe, juillet 1932, p.464.
105. For an offending picture by George Grosz, see: Europe, janvier 1929, p.28. For the trial record see: Europe, avril 1929, pp.537-554.
106. For information on the trial, see: Uwe M. Schneede, George Grosz - His life work. London, Gordon Fraser, 1979. pp.110-120.
107. H.T. Hunt, "Documents et dossiers pour la liberté: l'Affaire Mooney et Billings", Europe, novembre 1929, p.427.

108. See: "Petition pour Henri Guilbeaux", Europe, avril 1929, p.580.
109. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the
2nd October 1932 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.220.
110. For Guéhenno's signature on the Henri Guilbeaux petition, see:
"Pétition pour Henri Guilbeaux", Europe, novembre 1932, p.471.
111. Romain Rolland, "L'Aquittement de Henri Guilbeaux", Europe,
février 1933, p.280.
112. See: "L'Affaire Foch-Marty", Europe, février 1930, pp.254-256.
113. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the
4th August 1930 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.119.
114. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the
13th March 1930 in ibid., p.90.
115. See: F.D. p.127.
116. See: D.L.D.P. p.49.
117. See: "Lettres de Sacco et de Vanzetti (traduites par Pierre Vignard)",
Europe, mai 1930, pp. 5-40. Pierre Vignard was the pen name of
Mme. Jeanne Guéhenno, See: F.D. p.49.
118. See: "Jugement et mort de Sacco et de Vanzetti", Europe,
novembre 1930, pp.305-321.
119. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Deux hommes", Europe,
mars 1931, pp.416-422. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno,
Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.98.
120. Ibid., p.102.
121. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Viêt-Nam", Europe, avril 1931,
pp.564-569. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé
et l'avenir, p.107.

122. See: *ibid.*, p.107.
123. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 24th January 1931 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.143.
124. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Les sourds", Europe, novembre 1932, pp.459-485. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.181.
125. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 22nd September 1933. Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.R. Bloch.
126. From a letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 24th October 1934 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23. p.314.
127. Jean Guéhenno, "Plaidoyer pour les Instituteurs et les Professeurs poursuivis", Europe, mars 1935, pp.329-340. All quotations from J.F. Annexe 1, p.168.
128. Condorcet, Mémoires sur l'Instruction publique. Quoted in *ibid.*, p.171.
129. *Ibid.*, p.174.
130. See: *ibid.*, pp. 176-177, where Guéhenno demonstrates the incompatibility between the teacher and the bourgeois state, when he states that the teacher represents the cult of truth as well as intellectual probity. The teacher is therefore presented as a force for social progress.
131. Paul Nizan, "Notes - programme sur la philosophie" in Paul Nizan Intellectuel communiste 1926-1940. présentation [?]. Brochier. Paris, Maspero, 1967. p.209.

132. Paul Nizan, "L'ennemi public No.1" in ibid., p.247.
133. Guéhenno recalls this in D.L.D.P. p.35.
134. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 19th January 1931 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.141.
135. For information on the Five year plan and the source of the quotation, see: Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos du "Plan Quinquennal"", Europe, février 1931, pp. 262-267.
136. Ibid., p.265.
137. Notes de Jean Guéhenno in Michel Farbman, "Le plan russe", Europe, mai 1931. p.118.
138. Michel Farbman, "Le plan russe", Europe, mai 1931, p.99.
139. Ibid., p.118.
140. Michel Farbman, "La signification internationale du plan de Cinq ans", Europe, décembre 1931, p.562.
141. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La nature humaine est-elle en train de changer en Russie?", Europe, juillet 1933, p.440.
142. André Malraux, La Condition humaine. Paris, Gallimard, 1933, p.395.
143. See: David Cate, The Fellow Travellers, pp.64-67.
144. Guéhenno mentions being inundated with propaganda and being unsure about how to react, in a letter to Romain Rolland of the 9th February 1931 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.147.
145. For a more detailed account of the Soviet Plans and their effect on Western intellectuals see: David Cate, The Fellow Travellers, p.66.

146. Guéhenno asked Romain Rolland for advice on what to do with propaganda. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 9th February 1931 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23. p.147.
147. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Léon Trotski", Europe, octobre 1930, pp. 256-261. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.76.
148. See: Léon Trotski, "Histoire de la Révolution russe", Europe, décembre 1932, pp. 497-545. See also: Léon Trotski, "Histoire de la Révolution russe", Europe, janvier 1933, pp. 57-95.
149. Jean Lacouture, André Malraux: Une vie dans le siècle. Paris, Le Seuil, Collection Points, 1973. p.216.
150. Max Eastman quoted in Léon Pierre-Quint, "Les caractères religieux du communisme", Europe, juillet 1929, p.480.
151. Ibid., p.481.
152. Victor Serge quoted in Prosper Alfaric, "La campagne anti-religieuse en Russie", Europe, juillet 1930, pp.433-434.
153. Romain Rolland, "Lénine: L'Art et l'Action", Europe, janvier 1934, p.5.
154. A case in point is Europe's publication of George Friedmann, "Travail et communion en l'U.R.S.S.", Europe, septembre 1935, pp. 58-81. Friedman was one of the very few commentators who noted the rise in wage differentials in the U.S.S.R. See: David Cate, The Fellow Travellers, p.67.
155. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 15th September 1933 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.279.

156. From a letter from Jean Gu  henno to Romain Rolland of the 21st May 1935 in ibid., p.343.
157. Jean Gu  henno, "Notes de lecture. En de     de la R  volution", Europe, juillet 1929, p.456.
158. Ibid., p.457.
159. From a letter from Jean Gu  henno to Romain Rolland of the 11th November 1932 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23,
See also: Letter from Jean Gu  henno to Romain Rolland of the 6th July 1933 in ibid., p.274, where Gu  henno informs Rolland that the special issue on Marx has been cancelled.
160. Jean Gu  henno, "Notes de lecture. Le message de Lawrence d'apr  s sa correspondance 11", Europe, juin 1934, pp.261-268.
All quotations from Jean Gu  henno, Entre le pass   et l'avenir, p.229.
161. Jean Gu  henno, "Notes de lecture. En lisant Marx", Europe, octobre 1934, pp.258-262. All quotations from Jean Gu  henno, Entre le pass   et l'avenir, p.233.
162. This is a quotation from Gu  henno's own summary of Marx's views on alienation in ibid., p.234.
163. Jean Gu  henno, "Notes de lecture. De Montaigne    L  nine", Europe, mai 1935, p.109.
164. Ibid., p.110.
165. See: Jean Gu  henno, "Discours prononc   le 21 juin 1935 au Congr  s International des   crivains pour la D  fense de la Culture. "D  fense de la Culture"", Europe, juillet 1935, pp. 444-452. All quotations from Jean Gu  henno, Entre le pass   et l'avenir, p.263.

166. For the view that Marx was an existentialist in 1844-1945,
see: George Lichtheim, Marxism-An historical and critical
study. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964. p.236.
167. Karl Marx, Theses on Feuerbach, in Karl Marx. Frederick Engels.
Collected Works. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1976. vol.5. p.5.
168. See: George Lichtheim, Marxism-An historical and critical study,
pp. 35-37.
169. For the view that Western fellow travellers rejected the
deterministic aspects of Marx, see: David Caute, The Fellow
Travellers, p.251.
170. See: George Lichtheim, Marxism-An historical and critical
study, p.237.
171. See: *ibid.*, p.239.
172. Max Eastman, "Contre la dialectique marxiste", Europe, mai 1934,
pp. 15-18.
173. Herman Simpson, "Pour la dialectique marxiste", Europe, mai 1934,
p.25. For Simpson's views on Eastman, see: *ibid.*, pp. 19-25.
174. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Culture Européenne et
dénationalisation", Europe, octobre 1929, p.298.
175. *Ibid.*, p.298.
176. Jean Galtier-Boissière, À propos d'une histoire de la guerre,
quoted in Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos d'une
histoire de la guerre", Europe, mars 1933, pp. 438-440.
177. For information on this matter and the source of the quotation,
see: Jean Guéhenno, "Vouloir la paix", Europe, avril 1935,
pp. 564-568.

178. Guéhenno wrote to Romain Rolland expressing his desire for an issue of Europe to be devoted to war. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 7th June 1934 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.302.
179. Alain, "Vingt ans après", Europe, novembre 1934, p.324.
180. This information is given in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 1st August 1934. Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.-R. Bloch.
181. These quotations are taken from Jean Giono, "Je ne peux pas oublier", Europe, novembre 1934, pp.380-385.
182. Charles Vildrac, "Du P.C.D.F. à l'ancien combattant", Europe, novembre 1934, p.481.
183. Ibid., p.478.
184. Eugène Dabit, "Témoignage", Europe, novembre 1934, pp. 348-350.
185. These quotations are taken from Jean-Richard Bloch, "Lettre", Europe, novembre 1934, pp. 342-344.
186. See: F.D. p.197.
187. These quotations are taken from Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Sur une lettre de M. André Gide", Europe, décembre 1929, pp.589-592.
188. Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.138.
189. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Un sorcier: Le Comte Keyserling", Europe, septembre 1930. pp.111-118. All quotations from Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.72.

190. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Difficiles amours",
Europe, décembre 1930, pp. 588-593. All quotations from
Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.87.
191. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le système de circonlocutions",
Europe, octobre 1932, pp.267-272. All quotations from
Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir, p.178.
192. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le Nationalisme Allemand",
Europe, avril 1933, pp.575-576.
193. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Réflexions sur l'Europe",
Europe, mai 1933, p.122.
194. Guéhenno's close friend and collaborator Jean-Richard Bloch
is a good example.
195. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Journal", Europe, mars 1934,
p.420.
196. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos d'un plan et d'une
méthode", Europe, septembre 1934, pp.110-111. Nevertheless
Herbert R. Lottman claims that Guéhenno also took part in
the 12th February 1934 demonstration. See: Herbert R. Lottman,
La Rive gauche, p.108.
197. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos d'un plan et d'une
méthode", Europe, septembre 1934, p.112.
198. Jules Romains, "Pour que l'Europe soit", Europe, avril 1930, p.461.
199. See: *ibid.*, p.463 for the view that: "l'Européen actuel ne se
conçoit pas lui-même comme Européen".
200. *Ibid.*, p.482.

201. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the
4th August 1930 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.118.
202. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.72.
203. See: *ibid.*, pp.79-80.
204. Romain Rolland's "Déclaration" was however read out at the
Amsterdam conference. See: Romain Rolland, "Le Congrès
mondial d'Amsterdam", Europe, octobre 1932, p.251.
205. See: *ibid.*, p.249.
206. For a list of those who gave their "adhésion... au congrès",
see: *ibid.*, pp.253-254.
207. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the
20th December 1930 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.247.
208. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the
21st March 1933 in ibid., p.264.
209. For information on Guéhenno's involvement with the A.E.A.R.
see: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.88.
210. Mme Annie Guéhenno, in a conversation with the author held
on the 13th May 1984, was uncertain if Guéhenno was a member.
211. See: David Caute, The Fellow Travellers, p.138.
212. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years - Life. vol. IV. Eve of War
1933-1941. p.57.
213. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the
28th October 1934 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.315.
214. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years - Life, vol. IV. Eve of War
1933-1941, p.57.

215. This is the view of André Wurmser which is referred to in Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.109.
216. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 28th March 1934 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.299.
217. See: Pierre Gerôme, "Commentaire du manifeste", Europe, avril 1934, pp.589-591. See also: "Résistance intellectuelle au fascisme", Europe, mai 1934, pp.149-152.
218. David Cauter, Herbert R. Lottman, Ilya Ehrenbourg and André Chamson all record Guéhenno's role in the Congress.
219. For information on Ilya Ehrenbourg's involvement with the Congress, see: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, pp.15-16.
220. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years-Life. vol.IV. Eve of War 1933-1941, pp.65-67 and pp.72-73.
221. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.16.
222. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years-Life. vol. IV. Eve of War 1933-1941. pp.65-67.
223. See: ibid., p.72.
224. For an account of Ehrenbourg's dispute with André Breton and of the circumstances surrounding René Crevel's suicide, see: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, pp.17-18.
225. Monde quoted in ibid., p.126. For information on the Congress, see: ibid., p.126.
226. Ibid., p.115.
227. Ibid., p.124.
228. See: ibid., p.127.

229. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years-Life. vol.IV. Eve of War 1933-1941, p.72 and p.76.
230. See: Herbert R.Lottman, La Rive gauche, pp.119-125.
231. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years-Life. vol.IV. Eve of War 1933-1941, pp. 72-73.
232. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.16 and p.124.
233. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years-Life, Vol.IV. Eve of War 1933-1941, p.74.
234. For this information and source of quotation see: "Discours prononcé par Jean Guéhenno ou Congrès International des Écrivains, vendredi le 21 juin 1935". Published as: Jean Guéhenno, "Défense de la Culture", Europe, juillet 1935, p.446.
235. For this information and source of quotation, see: *ibid.*, p.447.
236. *Ibid.*, p.448.
237. *Ibid.*, pp.448-449.
238. For this information and source of quotation, see: *ibid.*, pp.449-452.
239. See: Lucie Mazauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, pp.76-77.
240. Simone de Beauvoir's recollection of this event is referred to in David Cate, Communism and the French intellectuals 1914-1960, p.93.
241. For this information and source of quotations, see: Jean-Richard Bloch, "Création Littéraire et société humaine", Europe, juillet 1935, pp.424-431.

242. For this information and source of quotations, see:

André Chamson, "Le nationalisme contre les réalités nationales", Europe, juillet 1935, pp.431-437.

243. For this information and source of quotations, see:

Georges Friedman, "Machine et humanisme", Europe, juillet 1935, pp.438-443.

244. For this information and source of quotations, see:

Paul Nizan, "Sur l'humanisme", Europe, juillet 1935, pp. 452-457.

245. See: F.D. p.164.

246. For information on the Association and the source of the quotation, see: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.130.

247. For a list of the members of the praesidium of the French Secretariat, see: *ibid.*, p.130.

248. This is the view presented in the surrealists' "Manifeste" on the congress and it is supported by Herbert R. Lottman. See: *ibid.*, p.131.

249. See: "Jean-Richard Bloch" in H.P. Thieme, Bibliographie de la littérature Française de 1800 a 1930. Paris, Librairie E. Droz, 1933.

250. See: David Caute, Communism and the French intellectuals 1914-1960, pp. 65-68.

251. See: "Jean-Richard Bloch" in H.P. Thieme, Bibliographie de la littérature Française de 1800 à 1930.

252. For the opinion that Romain Rolland influenced Jean-Richard Bloch, see: "J.-R. Bloch" in Talvart et Place, Bibliographie des Auteurs Modernes de langue française (1801-1927), Vol.11, Paris, Ed. Chronique des Lettres Françaises, Aux Horizons de France, 1928. p.40.
253. See: Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.86 and p.88.
254. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 10th June 1932. Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.-R. Bloch.
255. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 8th November 1930. Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.-R. Bloch.
256. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 22nd October 1931. Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.-R. Bloch. This view is also expressed in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 3rd July 1934. Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.-R. Bloch.
257. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Du Symbolisme", Europe, avril 1930, p.566
258. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Objections de conscience", Europe, novembre 1932, p.452.
259. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Paganisation de la pensée contemporaine", Europe, août 1929, p.627.

260. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Paroles à un congrès soviétique", Europe, septembre 1934, p.106.
261. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Mort et résurrection de Moscou", Europe, mars 1935, p.413.
262. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. De la Vulgarisation", Europe, novembre 1931, p.421. For other information on Bloch's views about science, see: *ibid.*, pp.420-421.
263. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. La Russie est-elle encore une patrie?", Europe, novembre 1930, pp. 400-401.
264. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. l'Unité de monde", Europe, mars 1932, pp.435-436.
265. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 6th June 1930. Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.-R. Bloch.
266. See: David Caute, The Fellow Travellers, pp.172-173. See also: David Caute, Communism and the French Intellectuals 1914-1960, pp. 122-123.
267. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. D'Erasmus à Proust", Europe, mai 1935, p.104.
268. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. D'Erasmus à Proust", Europe, octobre 1935, p.259.
269. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. D'Erasmus à Proust", Europe, août 1935, p.599.
270. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. D'Erasmus à Proust", Europe, octobre 1935, p.249.

271. This was claimed in conversation with the author by
Mme. Annie Guéhenno on the 14th May 1964.
272. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the
25th June 1928 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23. p.16.
273. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Pour le 70 anniversaire
de Romain Rolland", Europe, janvier 1936, p.100.
274. For this information and source of quotation see: *ibid.*
pp. 101-103.
275. From the unpublished notes on Europe prepared by Jean Guéhenno
for a radio programme with P. Sipriot in 1975, p.2. (In the
collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
276. Julien Benda, "Lettre a Jean Guéhenno" La Nouvelle Revue
Française, Tome XXXIV, avril 1930, p.553. This is also
quoted in Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Lettre ouverte à
M.J. Benda", Europe, février 1930, p.268.
277. Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Lettre ouverte à M.J. Benda",
Europe, février 1930, p.268.
278. Guéhenno met Romain Rolland twice, Once in Europe's office
in June 1928 and once in Villeneuve around Christmas 1932.
See: Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Pour le 70 anniversaire
de Romain Rolland", Europe, janvier 1936, p.100-104.
279. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 3rd
February 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.50.
280. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the
14th January 1929 in *ibid.*, p.49.

281. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 23rd December 1929 in ibid., p.79. See also: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 25th December 1929 in ibid., p.80. See also: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 28th December 1929 in ibid., p.82.
282. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 19th June 1930 in ibid., p.112.
283. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 7th August 1931 in ibid., p.167.
284. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 1st March 1933 in ibid., p.258.
285. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 6th July 1933 in ibid., p.275. See also: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 7th July 1933 in ibid., pp. 275-276.
286. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 16th January, 1935 in ibid., p.328. See also: Ervin Sinko, "À propos du procès Rakosi", Europe, mars 1935, pp. 421-431.
287. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 20th August 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.67.
288. From Romain Rolland's letter to the Soviet Academy of Arts and Sciences of 1925. Referred to in William Thomas Starr, Romain Rolland: One Against All. A Biography, p.221.
289. For the information that Romain Rolland did not take sides after the Congrès de Tours of 1920, see: David Caute, The Fellow Travellers, p.128, Romain Rolland's attitude in this matter is the same as that of Guéhenno.

290. See: William Thomas Starr, Romain Rolland: One Against All.
A Biography, p.16 and p.23.
291. See: *ibid.*, pp.20-24.
292. See: *ibid.*, p.75.
293. See: *ibid.*, p.97.
294. See: *ibid.*, pp.166-167.
295. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the
2nd September 1930 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.120.
296. This is confirmed by Guéhenno in his letter to Romain Rolland
of the 8th December 1930 in *ibid.*, p.137.
297. Louis Laloy, "Goethe et Beethoven", Europe, avril pp. 569-573.
298. Romain Rolland appealed to Guéhenno to publish Aragon's work.
See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the
26th November 1932 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.237.
Romain Rolland's request was however refused by Guéhenno.
See: Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.100.
299. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the
27th December 1932. in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.248.
300. For the Ukranian appeal, see: Letter from Romain Rolland to
Jean Guéhenno of the 15th September 1930 in *ibid.*, p.126.
See also: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the
10th May 1931 in *ibid.*, p.161. The Chinese appeal was
published as "À l'ambassadeur de Chine, à Paris", Europe,
janvier 1932, p.151. For information on the Birukoff material,
see: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 3rd
March 1930 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.88. See also:
Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 10th December
1933 in *ibid.*, pp. 292-293.

301. See for example: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 13th October 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.73. See also: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 14th November 1929 in ibid., p.77. See also: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 30th November 1931 in ibid., p.181.
302. For Romain Rolland's views on this matter, see: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 29th February 1930 in ibid., pp.86-87.
303. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 15th September 1930 in ibid., p.125, where Romain Rolland describes André Thérive's article on him in Le Temps as scandalous and protests at Thérive's name appearing in Europe, vowing never to write again in the review. Romain Rolland reaffirms this vow in a letter to Jean Guéhenno of the 15th October 1930 in ibid., p.133.
304. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 7th March 1933 in ibid., p.260.
305. See: Romain Rolland, "Les Cinq", Europe, janvier 1933, p.532. See also: Romain Rolland, "L'individualiste aux abois", Europe, octobre 1933, pp.153-173.
306. See: Romain Rolland, "Un grand mystique indien: Ramakrishna", Europe, février 1929, pp.153-182. See also: Romain Rolland, "un héros de l'Inde nouvelle: Vivekananda", Europe, mars 1929, pp. 305-337. This last article was offered to Guéhenno for publication in Europe. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 13th February 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.53.

307. See: Romain Rolland, "Un héros de l'Inde nouvelle: Vivekananda", Europe, mars 1929, p.305.
308. See: William Thomas Starr, Romain Rolland: One Against All. A Biography, p.204.
309. See: Romain Rolland, "Le réveil national de l'Inde et les réveilleurs", Europe, novembre 1929, pp.337-357.
310. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 5th June 1930 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.105.
See also: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 6th June 1930 in ibid., p.106.
311. See: Rabindranath Tagore, "Message à l'Angleterre", Europe, juillet 1930, pp.305-313. See also: M.K. Gandhi, "Lettre au vice-roi des Indes", Europe, juillet 1930, pp.313-324.
312. For the source of these quotations, see: Romain Rolland, "Préface à l'autobiographie de Gandhi", Europe, avril 1931, p.467 and p.490.
313. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 26th September 1932 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.219.
314. See: "Documents: Le jeûne de Gandhi", Europe, octobre 1932, pp. 153-159. See also: "Documents: Tagore et Gandhi pendant le jeûne", Europe, novembre 1932, pp.448-452.
315. Romain Rolland, "Le Congrès Mondial d'Amsterdam", Europe, octobre 1932, p.254.

316. Romain Rolland complains about insufficient coverage of Indian affairs in Europe, in a letter to Jean Guéhenno. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 1st April 1935 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.336.
317. Starr claims that Romain Rolland was very preoccupied with India in the early 1930 s. See: William Thomas Starr, Romain Rolland: One Against All. A Biography, pp.202-203.
318. Romain Rolland urged Guéhenno to publish a protest against British bombing of India. See: letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 28th October 1935 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23. p.352.
319. Ibid., p.353.
320. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 14th May 1930 in ibid., p.100.
321. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 20th April 1931 in ibid., pp. 157-158.
322. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 12th May 1930 in ibid., p.98.
323. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 22nd October 1931 in ibid., p.175.
324. Zareer Masani, "India's middle-class messiah", New Statesman, 10th December 1982, p.8.
325. Ibid., p.9.
326. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 23rd January 1936 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.370.

327. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 6th February 1936 in ibid., p.371.
328. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 16th December 1934 in ibid., p.323.
329. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 30th July 1935 in ibid., p.346.
330. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 10th January 1936 in ibid., p.363.
331. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 14th January, 1936 in ibid., p.365.
332. See: F.D. p.178.
333. This episode was recounted in a conversation with the author by Mme. Annie Guéhenno on the 15th May 1984.
334. From the unpublished notes on Europe prepared by Jean Guéhenno for a radio programme with P. Sipriot in 1975, p.6. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
335. See: "Aux abonnés et aux lecteurs d'Europe", Europe, avril 1936, p.577.
336. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 24th March 1936 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.373.
337. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 29th March 1936 in ibid., p.375.
338. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 7th April 1936 in ibid., p.376.

339. For this information and for information on the changes at Europe, see: Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.103.
340. See: *ibid.*, p.103.
341. See: *ibid.*, p.107.
342. Chamson was very critical of non-intervention in Spain in his articles for Vendredi. See for example: André Chamson, "La Justice est indivisible. Madrid en Flammes", Vendredi, No.55, 20 novembre 1936, p.1. See also: André Chamson, "Le vrai pacifisme", Vendredi, No.67, 12 février 1937, p.1.
343. See: Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe, p.108.
344. This is stated in the unpublished Jean Guéhenno-Curriculum vitae établi en 1945. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
345. The change in address is clear in Guéhenno's correspondence with Romain Rolland. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 14th November 1929 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.77. This fact was also confirmed by Mme. Annie Guéhenno in conversation with the author on the 14th May 1984.
346. From a letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 31st May 1933 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.273.
347. In an unpublished letter to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 27th June 1930, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Fonds J.-R. Bloch, Guéhenno states that: "je vais le 12 juillet faire deux conférences en Allemagne".

348. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 9th June 1931 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.163.
349. This is stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean-Richard Bloch of the 31st February 1935.
Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises.
Fonds. J.-R. Bloch.
350. Romain Rolland offers his condolences to Guéhenno in a private letter to him. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 2nd October 1931 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.173.
351. See: Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Guéhenno of the 26th April 1933 in ibid., p.267, where Rolland offers his condolences to Guéhenno.

Chapter Six

Vendredi

"Histoire de Vendredi", an article signed jointly by André Chamson, Jean Guéhenno and Andrée Viollis, makes the claim that Vendredi was born of the humiliation felt by writers of poor origins, when on the 6th February 1934 they saw "à quel point le peuple avait été berné"⁽¹⁾. The events of that day made a special impact on André Chamson, convincing him of the need for a Left-wing newspaper which would unite all the Republican forces. He himself states that "Vendredi a été pour moi la suite du 6 février"⁽²⁾, and Guéhenno confirms that the newspaper was Chamson's idea⁽³⁾. Lack of resources meant that the project could not be realised immediately, but in early 1935 Chamson met Emile Lohner, a former Temps journalist who resigned when that paper moved too far to the Right⁽⁴⁾. Together they strove to make their proposed newspaper a reality, and in later years when Vendredi came under threat from financial powers, Chamson's work as a director was greatly helped by the honesty of Lohner⁽⁵⁾, who was appointed the paper's administrator⁽⁶⁾. The newspaper became a real possibility in June 1935⁽⁷⁾, when Chamson persuaded Daladier that there was a real need for a democratic Left-wing weekly⁽⁸⁾, and Radical sources contributed 5000,000 F.F. to the project⁽⁹⁾. Guéhenno claims the money came in the form of a loan from a Radical publisher who wished to fight the "Grande Presse"⁽¹⁰⁾. The most important aspect of this loan however, was that it guaranteed the new weekly's editorial freedom⁽¹¹⁾. With 500,000 F.F. at his disposal, Chamson began preparations for the launching of his newspaper. He invited Guéhenno to collaborate with him and Guéhenno immediately accepted the offer despite the fact that he was still editor of Europe: ""Je marche" m'a-t-il répondu

tout de suite"⁽¹²⁾. In fact Guéhenno's continuing ties with Europe were a great advantage to Vendredi in the early months of its existence, as he brought many of his collaborators to the new venture. Chamson and Guéhenno then sought the help of Andrée Viollis and together formed a tripartite "direction collégiale"⁽¹³⁾. None of the three directors received a salary⁽¹⁴⁾, but Guéhenno and Chamson especially kept firm control over editorial policy, frequently writing the leading articles. Madeleine Berry claims that "l'éditorial était, en principe, assumé par Chamson qui le signait généralement "Vendredi""⁽¹⁵⁾. The sheer number of articles written by Chamson show the extent to which he treated Vendredi as his personal mouthpiece.

The three directors appointed the Left-wing catholic Louis Martin-Chauffier as Rédacteur en Chef to take care of the day-to-day running of the paper, whilst Emile Lohner became administrator, André Ulmann secrétaire de rédaction and André Wurmser an outside helper⁽¹⁶⁾. Although this editorial team lacked experience⁽¹⁷⁾ it had considerable success in assuring the collaboration of writers of stature. Vendredi's contributors included André Gide, Romain Rolland, Jacques Maritain, Jules Romains, Roger Martin du Gard, Jean Schlumberger, André Malraux and Paul Nizan, who were joined by lesser known writers like Pierre Bost, Jean Prévost, Jacques Kayser, Claude Aveline, Jean Cassou, Eugène Dabit and Roger Vitrac⁽¹⁸⁾. Some collaborators had specific tasks: Chamson's wife Lucie Mazauric took responsibility for fine art criticism, Pierre Abraham was the main literary critic⁽¹⁹⁾ and Pierre Bost wrote all the film reviews. Illustrations appearing in the paper were mainly by Moisan,

Jean Effel, J. Pruvost and Jean Bruller - in later years better known as Vercors⁽²⁰⁾. The Directors' policy was to seek contributions from major writers and transcend the party divisions on the Left. The latter aim is reflected both in the persons of the directors, all of whom had different political ideas but no party allegiances⁽²¹⁾, and in the choice of collaborators. Madeleine Berry sees the collaborators as "une palette variée où l'on va du rouge franc à la touche d'un rose presque imperceptible"⁽²²⁾. What they all had in common however, was devotion to the paper, and to this end they were prepared to make sacrifices, thereby enabling Vendredi to publish writers of quality whilst maintaining a low price of fifteen sous (1.50 f.f.)⁽²³⁾. The title chosen for the newspaper-Vendredi, was an allusion both to the day of publication and to the savage in Robinson Crusoe⁽²⁴⁾. It was therefore a symbol of the directors' concern for the unenlightened people - a concern which Guéhenno had earlier expressed so forcefully in Caliban parle.

Although Chamson always emphasised that Vendredi was a unique phenomenon among French newspapers it was certainly not the only Left-wing paper in existence. Emmanuel Berl's Marianne for example, was a Republican paper of some standing, but it did not satisfy Chamson, who wanted something that was "indépendant de toute attache commerciale"⁽²⁵⁾. Regards and Sept, the other main Left-wing competitors to Vendredi were biased to the communists and the catholics respectively⁽²⁶⁾ and could not therefore appeal to a wide readership.

Vendredi itself never sought to compete with the other Left-wing papers and a consideration of its stated aims shows why this was so. In broad terms the newspaper sought to support general moral ideas as well as specific political objectives, which meant that the latter were consistently seen in terms of the former. Vendredi declared its allegiance to truth, which was seen as the inspiration for the paper: "Vendredi naissait... de la conviction que des honnêtes gens avaient ensemble qu'un journal... absolument libre et vrai... (fut nécessaire)"⁽²⁷⁾. This was certainly Guéhenno's interpretation of the paper's aims⁽²⁸⁾. The support of freedom in its widest sense was a major aim of Vendredi. Chamson recalls that "nous étions hanté par le problème de la liberté"⁽²⁹⁾, and all three directors stated their wish to serve this cause⁽³⁰⁾. In practical terms this meant a battle for readers with the Right-wing papers Gringoire and Candide, which were seen by the directors as representing the interests of those who threatened freedom in France. Guéhenno recalls that Vendredi's intention was to cater for those readers who voted Left but habitually read Candide⁽³¹⁾, so Gringoire and Candide rather than any Left-wing paper were the models the directors sought to both imitate and surpass. Guéhenno accepted that Gringoire could amuse its readers, but insisted that Vendredi should also express their faith⁽³²⁾. Chamson had a similar view of what Vendredi's models should be: Madeleine Berry states that he was "hanté par le désir de fonder un hebdomadaire qui serait, à gauche ce que Gringoire et Candide représentaient à droite"⁽³³⁾.

Vendredi's objectives were not however limited to a debate with the Right-wing press. Its most important task was the support of a political alliance - the Front Populaire. It is because Vendredi spoke for this alliance that Guéhenno could claim that in this paper "Caliban... allait vraiment parler" (F.D. p.203). The paper was born with the Front Populaire⁽³⁴⁾ and saw itself as its mouthpiece. In a statement of intent all three directors made the point that "Vendredi n'a voulu être que son porte-parole!"⁽³⁵⁾. In La Foi difficile Guéhenno affirms that this was indeed the intention⁽³⁶⁾. It should be realised however, that this was a political but not a party-political decision. This is made clear in an editorial of the 10th July 1936: "À Vendredi nous maintiendrons notre union totale avec le peuple de France"⁽³⁷⁾. This concern for the working people was reflected in the management structure of the paper itself. The Serment published in advance of the first issue of Vendredi was a unique document which prefigured the employee-controlled papers of the post 1945 period⁽³⁸⁾.

Notwithstanding the stated aims of the directors, when the first issue of Vendredi finally appeared on the 8th November 1935, both its content and format reflected the concerns of its collaborators rather than those of the working man. Despite the declarations of both Guéhenno and Chamson in favour of "le peuple", the paper actually presented itself as "l'hebdomadaire littéraire, politique et satirique"⁽³⁹⁾. The emphasis was very much on literary as well as on artistic matters, and Vendredi was proud of being "l'hebdomadaire fondé par des Écrivains et des

Journalistes et dirigé par eux"⁽⁴⁰⁾. The format, although it varied slightly in the early months kept to the following pattern: The first page was devoted to editorials, major articles on current affairs and other important matters of national political significance. The latter sometimes overspilled onto the second page, which had a permanent feature: "Les Quatre Coins", dealing with foreign affairs. The fourth and fifth pages dealt exclusively with literary criticism and book reviews, whilst the sixth concerned itself with entertainment, including film, theatre and record reviews. The three following pages were reserved for long serialisations, and it is here that the illustrators' work was most prominent. Page ten contained articles on sport and youth, whilst the final page "Vendredi de la Femme", dealt with matters of specifically female interest.

Given this structure it was clear thar Vendredi would appeal mainly to the literate and to the educated. Guéhenno describes the reader of Vendredi as someone whose social position was between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. He includes here those whom Albert Thibaudet termed "La République des Professeurs", and more specifically its junior members, the "instituteurs". With hindsight Guéhenno also admits that Vendredi was incapable of attracting a vast readership, because a Parisian paper with 50% literature did not suit the tastes of working people⁽⁴¹⁾. Despite the fact that the first issue attained a very promising 300,000 sales⁽⁴²⁾, this figure was not sustained. Although the scale of the subsequent drop in sales is in dispute⁽⁴³⁾, it is clear that the directors' plans of achieving 500,000 readers⁽⁴⁴⁾ were over-ambitious.

Although Guéhenno dreamt of a newspaper where Caliban could speak, if only through an intermediary, the reality was that described by Chamson: "Vendredi) devint tout de suite l'organe des intellectuels"⁽⁴⁵⁾. This was in part a consequence of the early help given to Chamson by the Syndicat des instituteurs and the Syndicat des postiers. When he approached them and explained that "nous (à Vendredi) allons travailler... pour ce qui est notre idéal profond", he was given a list of the unions' members, that is a complete mailing list of potential readers⁽⁴⁶⁾. Union help was critical to the early success of the paper. Madeleine Berry states that "Vendredi connaît... un grand succès grâce en partie aux syndicats, et notamment à la Fédération des Fonctionnaires dont Robert Lacoste était secrétaire général"⁽⁴⁷⁾. A particularly important instance of union favour to Vendredi was the special permission it received to carry on printing during a newspaper strike. This dispensation, signed by Léon Jouhaux and Racamond, enabled the paper to flourish by and profit from its temporary monopoly. Chamson recalls the "dans l'absence totale de la presse Vendredi a connu un succès magnifique"⁽⁴⁸⁾. The political parties of the Front Populaire also helped the paper⁽⁴⁹⁾, but this help is not as significant as that offered by the unions. This is because the unions helped by supplying a readership of literate people with intellectual ambitions, which both obliged and permitted Vendredi to become a predominantly literary, intellectual paper, catering for their needs.

Whereas in most cases the social background of a paper's readership is important because it helps explain the paper's

views, this is less significant in the case of Vendredi, whose purpose was to serve an alliance of several social classes.

Vendredi was unique in that it served the Front Populaire rather than its constituent parties, so a study of this paper must take particular account of this special perspective. At the same time because Vendredi sought to be more than a mouthpiece for political propaganda, the non-political features of the paper also require attention even if they do not constitute its chief source of interest.

Given that the aim of Vendredi was to serve the Front Populaire, the first problem which arises is the paper's view of the alliance. In broad terms Vendredi supported the concept of a united Left and in this respect it popularised the views of the Comité de Vigilance des Intellectuels anti-fascistes (C.V.I.A.-F.). The directors claimed that both Vendredi and the C.V.I.A.-F. were born of the same disgust and revolt at the events of the 6th February 1934⁽⁵⁰⁾. The problem for Vendredi however, was the meaning of the word "united". As far as the participating political parties were concerned, the Front Populaire was an alliance around a pre-agreed programme. The objectives of this programme were clearly defined reforms, which included the 40 hr week, public works, the nationalisation of the munitions factories and the reform of the Banque de France⁽⁵¹⁾. The clear formulation of the purposes of the Front Populaire enabled the Blum government to execute the programme rapidly with the support of its majority in parliament. This swiftness in the realisation of the programme proved however, to be a major difficulty for the alliance. Because,

as Madeleine Berry recalls: "presque tout le programme de Front Populaire qui devait être réalisé en quatre ans le sera en moins d'un an"⁽⁵²⁾ the government, which represented the Front Populaire⁽⁵³⁾ was left in a vacuum. Blum drew attention to this problem in a speech at the Luna Park of the 6th June 1937. In this speech Blum states that the Front Populaire programme "est la force et la limite du gouvernement", and that to go beyond it would require further discussions among the political parties of the alliance⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Although the Vendredi editorials of January and May 1936 demonstrated an awareness that the Front Populaire was basically a programme which was both detailed⁽⁵⁵⁾ and "logique et raisonnable"⁽⁵⁶⁾, even Chamson, who understood that the Front Populaire was a "rassemblement" of political parties, unions and cultural organisations around a set of objectives⁽⁵⁷⁾, eventually succumbed to the view of his fellow director Guéhenno, that the Front Populaire was a spiritual ideal. Consequently the wish to see an alliance transformed into a spiritual movement, characterised the numerous editorial statements on the Front Populaire and the term "Union of the Left" took on a new meaning. Chamson saw the enthusiasm of the masses for the Front Populaire as the sign of a will for spiritual and moral transformation. Moreover: "la fin même de... la transformation nécessaire de l'économie... ne peut pas être autre chose que... l'épanouissement de l'être humain"⁽⁵⁸⁾. He also stated very firmly that the Front Populaire was not just a tactical coalition, but "un mouvement d'esprit"⁽⁵⁹⁾. All three directors of Vendredi jointly

made the point, that "l'action du Front Populaire dépasse l'action de son gouvernement. Elle s'exerce... vers plus de culture et plus de dignité"⁽⁶⁰⁾. At a time of crisis within the parliamentary alliance the directors justified the existence of Vendredi in moral, rather than political terms: "la lutte pour la vérité et la liberté... seule, justifie l'existence de notre journal"⁽⁶¹⁾. This is because "ce journal est né de la mystique du Front Populaire"⁽⁶²⁾. The view of the directors was shared by Victor Basch, who praised the practical achievements of the government, but criticised the behaviour of the C.G.T., "non encore suffisamment orientée vers des fins spirituelles"⁽⁶³⁾. The strongest advocate of the "spiritual" view of the alliance however, was Jean Guéhenno, who expressed it in lead articles signed with his own name. On the eve of the first round of voting on the 24th April 1936, he refused to name specific parties, but urged the nation to vote for "Du pain, la paix, la liberté"⁽⁶⁴⁾. Three months later he reminded his readers of the spiritual aims of the Front Populaire, saying: "les seules révolutions que la France veut accomplir doivent rendre les hommes plus libres"⁽⁶⁵⁾. Guéhenno praised the bloodless revolution of 1936, because "(elle) a fait de l'ouvrier français l'ouvrier le plus libre d'Europe, celui dont la dignité est le mieux garantie par la loi"⁽⁶⁶⁾. In February 1937 he again praised the Front Populaire for its moral achievements: "Jamais la justice ne fut-elle si proche"⁽⁶⁷⁾. In making such statements Guéhenno was fully aware that his attitude was a continuation of the spirit of Jaurès and he was honest about this. He praised Jaurès because Jaurès saw the political question as a moral one,

and at the same time he condemned "une certaine bande" (the communists) for their view that violence was necessary for revolution⁽⁶⁸⁾. Guéhenno's emphasis on the spiritual and the moral was not restricted to the context of a discussion of the Front Populaire. He criticised the whole modern lifestyle in an article entitled "Devenons-nous plus bêtes", where he attacked the widespread contemporary belief "qui nous fait croire que tout nous est dû, et sans que nous devions nous, fournir le moindre effort"⁽⁶⁹⁾. A curious consequence of the view that the Front Populaire was an ideal, was the contempt for political disputes shown by Vendredi. Guéhenno made it very clear that "le Front populaire *vaut* mieux que tous les partis"⁽⁷⁰⁾. Furthermore all three directors stressed repeatedly that "nous ne sommes pas des politiques", and condemned "les combinaisons et... des marchandages"⁽⁷¹⁾. Chamson speaking for Vendredi, put forward the view that unlike a politician, he saw his role as that of a guardian of principles⁽⁷²⁾.

Although it is important to note that Vendredi understood the Front Populaire as an ideal rather than as an alliance, this gives only a general explanation of why the paper adopted certain attitudes to the everyday problems of the government. The paper's response to events on a day by day basis is at least as important as its general intentions, and it is worthy of extended study, because it reflects not only the problems of its directors, but also those of the political alliance itself. Such a study is further justified by the fact, that after the election victory of May 1936 all three directors

declared their desire that Vendredi should become "le journal de la victoire populaire"⁽⁷³⁾.

The immediate problem posed by the paper's response to everyday problems is the attitude towards the political divisions within the Front Populaire itself. After the first round electoral victory of the alliance in April 1936, to which Chamson, Guéhenno, Jean Cassou and André Wurmser contributed by their articles and speeches in favour of the Left's candidates⁽⁷⁴⁾, Chamson, Guéhenno and Viollis restated their intention that Vendredi would be the organ of the Front Populaire⁽⁷⁵⁾. The importance of Vendredi to the Front Populaire alliance was acknowledged by Blum himself shortly after the elections. Chamson recalls that:

"Blum nous a dit à Jean Guéhenno et à moi le lendemain des élections... "En France on gagne des élections en déplaçant deux ou trois cent mille voix. J'ai conscience que Vendredi en a déplacé infiniment plus. Au nom du gouvernement de la République - je vous remercie""⁽⁷⁶⁾.

Within three months however, the first conflicts within the Front Populaire made themselves known, when the Communists made a proposal to enlarge the alliance. The Vendredi editorial of the 11th September 1936 condemned the idea as impractical and divisive, calling instead for discipline and unity⁽⁷⁷⁾. A more serious threat to the Front Populaire later came from the Parti Radical-Socialiste, whose loyalty was called into question. The editorial of the 23rd October 1936 reminded the party's congress that there was fundamental unity among the Left on such issues as social justice and freedom, and therefore urged

the Radicals to resist the Right's pressure to play the role of a "Fifth Column" within the alliance⁽⁷⁸⁾. In the event Vendredi's fears were not borne out by the Radical congress. Nevertheless the editorial of the following week condemned the government's foreign policy, which was in the hands of the Radicals, who occupied the Quai d'Orsay⁽⁷⁹⁾. As the paper of the Front Populaire, Vendredi was always very sensitive to internal disunity: In the first anniversary issue of the paper Guéhenno condemned the selfishness of all the political parties in the Front Populaire and reminded them of Germany, where the Republic died as a result of the disunity of the Left⁽⁸⁰⁾. Moreover when splits did occur, Vendredi's policy was to play down their significance. When Marceau Pivert resigned from the secrétariat of the Présidence du Conseil where he was responsible for radio broadcasting⁽⁸¹⁾, because he refused to support increasing spending on defence, the paper asked him to give an explanation of his action. Pivert stated his reasons in detail, but at the start of his article he emphasised that his resignation should not be seen as a split in the Front Populaire, or in the S.F.I.O.⁽⁸²⁾. Similarly, when the government was forced to take financial measures hurting the poor, Chamson played down their significance and urged the workers to make sacrifices, because they were demanded by their own government⁽⁸³⁾. The economic crisis of the spring of 1937 however, not only affected the workers, it affected Vendredi itself. The issue of the 9th April 1937 devoted the entire front page to a detailed account of the paper's finances. Sales were given as averaging 52,343, which in effect meant a readership of 200,000.

Unfortunately the financial situation which was sound until January 1937, now began to cause concern. To avert a crisis Vendredi's directors announced a reduction in the number of pages and appealed for help⁽⁸⁴⁾.

In June 1937 Blum's first reformist cabinet resigned and was replaced by a government headed by Camille Chautemps. The reaction of Vendredi's directors was one of surprise at the speed of the resignation, and their joint editorial demanded to know why Blum abandoned the struggle with the Senate so easily. They gave their support to the motion of the C.V.I.A.-F. of the 24th June 1937, which interpreted the political crisis as a conflict between a Senate which wanted a government of Trusts and Banks, and the majority of the French people who did not want such a government. The directors also put forward their own view that the Front Populaire "n'est pas une formation parlementaire, ni une formation politique... (mais) le climat vital de (la) France". Vendredi also hoped the Chautemps cabinet would be a success, but noted its concern at the pleasure of Le Temps and the disenchantment of the Front Populaire supporters in the streets⁽⁸⁵⁾. Their initial doubts were quelled when both the P.C.F. and the S.F.I.O. gave their support to Chautemp's Radical government⁽⁸⁶⁾, but reappeared⁽⁸⁶⁾ in November 1937, when Chautemp's new supporters demanded a "pause". Although the new government had the support of both the Front Populaire parliamentary majority and Vendredi - who did not wish its fall, the pause in the timetable of reforms was seen as misguided⁽⁸⁷⁾. On the 10th December 1937 Vendredi's

editorial expressed its regret that the "pause" was now permanent and asked: "le programme précis du Rassemblement populaire, se souvient - on qu'il existe?"⁽⁸⁸⁾. What concerned the paper even more however, was the general weakness of the Chautemps government. The lack of action on the revelations about an anti-state plot and the silence over Spain were singled out as examples of government timidity⁽⁸⁹⁾. As far as the latter was concerned, Vendredi saw non-intervention as a farce and an encouragement to fascism, although it accepted that the Chautemps government was only partly to blame: "la faiblesse... des grandes démocraties a détruit les conditions de la paix"⁽⁹⁰⁾. The weakness of the government was a prelude to the final collapse of the parliamentary coalition. By November 1937 this coalition was already so precarious, that despite its earlier bold statements on the U.S.S.R. Vendredi now dismissed the news of further executions there with a warning that on no account must this news break the unity of the Front Populaire⁽⁹¹⁾. The final division came in January 1938 when Chautemps broke the Front's parliamentary unity. The unsigned editorial of the 21st January regretted that the P.C.F. was thrown into opposition and the S.F.I.O. excluded from the cabinet, but no blame was placed on the Radicals, as Chautemps was urged to carry out the Front Populaire programme and rely only on its majority in the Chamber⁽⁹²⁾. This same issue of Vendredi did however contain a second editorial which shared the view of L'Intransigeant that Chautemps brought down his own government, and it concluded that: "le Front Populaire a été attaqué avec persévérance et discrétion par M.M. Chautemps et Bonnet. Dans le pays il est intact"⁽⁹³⁾. This was the first

open attack on the government by Vendredi, which hitherto had tempered its criticism out of a concern for unity. All such considerations lost their relevance once the socialists left the government, hence the subsequent criticism of the Front Populaire leadership made in the editorials. An unsigned editorial of the 28th January 1938 accused the leaders of having lacked the audacity to "faire... (la) politique des masses"⁽⁹⁴⁾. A subsequent conflict between the government and the C.G.T. over the proposed "code de travail", led to Vendredi warning the government against the formation of a Right-wing "Union Nationale" by relying on Right votes⁽⁹⁵⁾.

Although the dissolution of the Front Populaire on a governmental level disappointed Vendredi, this had little effect on policy and did nothing to cure the weakness of the government. An attempt by Blum to form a government based on the Front Populaire failed in March 1938 and Vendredi blamed the nationalists in parliament⁽⁹⁶⁾, as well as the Radicals, who refused to share power with the Communists⁽⁹⁷⁾. Nonetheless the ultimate failure of Blum to form a government was not seen as a disaster by Vendredi. The editorial of the 25th March 1938 quoted Paul Rivet's letter to Blum in Le Populaire, which warned against the dangers of forming a government by making concessions to the Right which would involve "l'abandon des conquêtes, des devoirs, et du programme de Front Populaire"⁽⁹⁸⁾. The editorial made the point that "les inquiétudes (de Rivet) sont les nôtres"⁽⁹⁹⁾. What made Vendredi's attitude confusing was that it rejected any compromise with the Right, but at the same time called for firm

and strong government, because of the fascist threat: "la force et la fermeté à leur tour (sont) les seuls moyens de la paix"⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. In practise Vendredi, through Chamson, now took a purely negative attitude to politics, attacking the government for weakness⁽¹⁰¹⁾ and retrospectively dismissing the entire achievement of the Front Populaire in parliament, as "quelques échafaudages... eux-mêmes abandonnés"⁽¹⁰²⁾. In his last editorial pronouncements on the Front Populaire Chamson contrasted the "mystique" of the Rassemblement Populaire with the reality of party divisions⁽¹⁰³⁾. He regretted the coming of the non-Front Populaire Daladier government, but was adamant about who was to blame: "les responsables de la condition actuelle sont les partis, par leur rivalités, et... certains hommes dont les... ambitions ou les erreurs... ont altéré la cohésion (du Front Populaire)"⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. On the 13th May 1938 Guéhenno was obliged to accept that "le Front Populaire est politiquement dissocié"⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. He also blamed political parties for this, but unlike Chamson he believed the combat of the last two years was not in vain, because "la dignité humaine a augmenté dans ce pays"⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. This particular issue of Vendredi also marked the resignation of the directors as the paper's political editors. All three signed a "Déclaration" which stated that henceforth "Vendredi se consacrera au-dessus de la mêlée politique... l'équipe de Vendredi et de la N.R.F. conjugueront... leurs efforts"⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. This "Déclaration", because it amounted to an admission that the Front Populaire was dead, begged the question why Vendredi should continue to exist. This problem was finally resolved on the 10th November 1938, when the editorial announced that with the political dissolution of the Front Populaire, "le raison d'être de Vendredi disparaît"⁽¹⁰⁸⁾.

Consequently Vendredi was to change both its name and its role. Unlike Vendredi the new title Reflets wished to present well argued viewpoints representing various shades of opinion, but leaving the actual choices to the reader⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. That the directors should wish to carry on publishing after the Front Populaire collapsed was not altogether surprising. Vendredi had moral as well as political aims, hence it could continue on the former level. This is why the directors were able to write: "Reflets demeure ce qu'était Vendredi - le journal de la vérité et de la liberté"⁽¹¹⁰⁾.

Before considering the various aspects of the Front Populaire's internal and foreign policy, it is as well to look at Vendredi's view of why the Front Populaire collapsed, because it justifies the paper's constant concern with unity throughout its life. Most of the blame for the collapse was placed on the internal divisions within the alliance and Guéhenno in particular persisted in this view throughout his life: "les... intrigues et... l'esprit totalitaire détruiraient... le Front Populaire et Vendredi" (D.L.D.P. p.52). Certainly there was no serious threat to the alliance from the Right. Writing in Vendredi on the 15th October 1937 Victor Basch, president of the Comité National du Rassemblement Populaire, quoted the view of Le Temps that after fifteen months of Front Populaire government and despite the economic problems, the Right lost 400,000 voters in the first round of the élections cantonales held in October 1937⁽¹¹¹⁾. The view of Victor Basch and Vendredi is supported by P. Warwick who claims that the Right

was disunited. He also claims that Front Populaire parliamentary solidarity persisted throughout the four governments, but admits that there was little ideological unity within the alliance from its inception⁽¹¹²⁾. The second reason for the Front Populaire's failure outlined by Vendredi was the attitude of the Senate. The Senate opposed Blum's devaluation⁽¹¹³⁾ in October 1936, Chautemps's budget in January 1938⁽¹¹⁴⁾, his "Statut de travail" in March 1938⁽¹¹⁵⁾ and prevented Blum forming a government in April 1938⁽¹¹⁶⁾. Nevertheless the Senate opposition was not synonymous with the Right, but rather it demonstrated a constitutional problem of the Third Republic. After the resignation of the first Blum government, André Wurmser, writing in Vendredi regretted that the Senate toppled the government, but put the real blame on the constitution, which represented the France of 1875⁽¹¹⁷⁾. The same view was taken by Paul Gérin, who wrote in the same issue of the paper, reminding the readers of the many previous governments of both the Right and the Left which were toppled in the past by the Senate. Furthermore he drew attention to the central weakness of the constitution in this matter - the impossibility of dissolving the Senate⁽¹¹⁸⁾. Vendredi editor Louis Martin-Chauffier believed the Senate to be an essentially conservative force acting to frustrate all governments: "que ce soit de droite ou de gauche que viennent les projets... (les sénateurs) les enterrent"⁽¹¹⁹⁾.

Given that Vendredi saw the main threat to the Front Populaire as coming from within, very little space is devoted to doctrinal and political arguments with the Right. The main charge against

them is anti-patriotism, which Vendredi saw reflected in the articles of the Right-wing press that painted a picture of a divided nation and a weak government, thereby damaging French interests abroad⁽¹²⁰⁾. Moreover in parliament the Right was accused of exploiting every government problem, regardless of the national interest⁽¹²¹⁾, whilst outside parliament it was accused of provoking labour unrest⁽¹²²⁾. It is worth remembering that on the matter of patriotism Vendredi was itself attacked by Jean Paulhan during the Occupation⁽¹²³⁾. Perhaps the most serious charge against the Right however, was in Vendredi's view its financial support of the extreme Right.

Louis Martin-Chauffier accused Laval and Tardieu of secretly financing La Roque⁽¹²⁴⁾, a charge which was repeated when Tardieu admitted he received La Roque while Président de Conseil⁽¹²⁵⁾.

Louis Martin-Chauffier was shocked when Tardieu admitted in court at La Roque's trial that he did pay La Roque⁽¹²⁶⁾. The affair was disconcerting because it showed that the Right had financed a man, who on the 6th February 1934 posed a direct threat to the Republic. This threat from the Far-Right was taken so seriously by Vendredi, that conspiracies were seen everywhere, indicating a somewhat paranoid view. This was perhaps understandable given that both the paper and the Front Populaire were born of a reaction to the events of the 6th February 1934, and moreover that the fascist Leagues became most active after this date⁽¹²⁷⁾. Matters arising from the events of that day were certainly given prominence by Vendredi. The Right was accused of misusing the Stavisky affair to

discredit those in power when the scandal was discovered and thereby protect their own people, who were also involved⁽¹²⁸⁾.

In particular Jean Chiappe was accused by Vendredi of a political cover-up by silencing witnesses at the Stavisky trial⁽¹²⁹⁾.

Chiappe was also blamed for the behaviour of those policemen who caused the riot of the 6th February 1934. These same policemen were blamed for the tragic events at Clichy of March 1937, when a Left-wing picket of a Right-wing League meeting turned into a riot during which five leftists lost their lives⁽¹³⁰⁾. Finally Chiappe was accused of financial abuses as head of the Conseil Municipal de Paris, by borrowing money to build lavatories in the metro, which however already existed⁽¹³¹⁾.

The preoccupation with the threat to the Republic as reflected in the editorials of Vendredi, owed much to André Chamson. Chamson's view of the threat to the Republic and of the events of the 6th February 1934 is most fully presented in La Galère of 1939, where "he wished... to photograph a short-lived crisis from as many angles as possible, simultaneously in time"⁽¹³²⁾. In this book Chamson adopts a moral perspective: "he reveals to the reader an individual named Rabaud, a middle-class intellectual who insists on his moral dignity"⁽¹³³⁾. More important however, is the fact that having become unwittingly involved in a street riot, Rabaud realises that "des forces occultes ont tenté de détruire la République"⁽¹³⁴⁾. In later years Chamson gave the struggle against fascism in France as one of the main aims of Vendredi⁽¹³⁵⁾. Consequently editorials written by him called for the abolition of the para-military Leagues⁽¹³⁶⁾ and later

for the dissolution of the Parti Socialiste Français as well as the imprisoning of La Roque⁽¹³⁷⁾. Benoît Frachon, "secrétaire - adjoint" of the C.G.T. supported Chamson in this, claiming that the Parti Socialiste Français was nothing less than the reconstituted Croix de Feu⁽¹³⁸⁾. When interest in the 6th February 1934 and the Leagues subsided, Vendredi turned its attention to Charles Maurras's alleged threats to assassinate pro-war ministers and his appeal to Right-wing civil servants to betray the Left-wing government⁽¹³⁹⁾. On the 26th November 1937, after the discovery of a plot against the state, Chamson demanded to know the names of the leaders of the alleged plot as well as due punishment for those who like Maurras, encouraged it⁽¹⁴⁰⁾. In the four weeks following the revelations on this matter, Chamson repeatedly called on the government to act on the evidence and emphasised the seriousness of the problem⁽¹⁴¹⁾. When in January 1938 it was revealed that the bomb attack against the headquarters of the Organisation patronale de la région parisienne in the rue de Presbourg of the 11th September 1937, was carried out by the Right-wing Comité social d'action révolutionnaire (C.S.A.R.) - a fraction of the Cagoule led by Eugène Deloncle⁽¹⁴²⁾, Chamson denounced the attack as a provocation: "le C.S.A.R. n'était que l'émanation occulte des trusts et des ligues dissoutes"⁽¹⁴³⁾. After the arms seized from the C.S.A.R. exploded at a storage depot at Villejuif, André Ulmann saw this as proof that the grenades manufactured for the C.S.A.R. were unsuitable for storage, because they were intended for immediate use in a civil war⁽¹⁴⁴⁾. Given the seriousness of the plot, Vendredi was far from satisfied by

the government's reaction to it. An expression of this dissatisfaction was a major article by Jacques Arnaud of the 29th April 1938, which accused the police and the judiciary of a cover-up⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. The final word on this matter however was a prophetic article by Chamson, which accused certain unnamed people of seeking the victory of a foreign power over France, because this would enable them to defeat their enemies at home⁽¹⁴⁶⁾.

One of the most important problems of the Front Populaire which was reflected in Vendredi was that of the economy, although the extent to which Vendredi represented Front Populaire economic policy is open to debate. What is immediately clear is that Vendredi was violently opposed to the big capitalist monopolies and saw financiers as a major threat to the régime. The behaviour of the monopolies was therefore regularly exposed by the paper. In the early days of Blum's government Vendredi noted that the Trust-controlled press was making a concerted effort to dissuade him from carrying out the promised reforms⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. By October 1936 the Comité de Forges was shown to be on the offensive: it appealed for businessmen to unite in order to resist social reforms⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. The editorial of the 30th April 1937 named the Banks and the Trusts as a menace to the government and therefore called for structural reforms of the economy⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. When the Franc fell in October 1937, Vendredi in an unsigned editorial interpreted the view of Le Temps that only an "Union Nationale" could restore confidence in the Franc, as a veiled threat from the Banks that they would only lend money to a Right-wing government⁽¹⁵⁰⁾. Such an interpretation

was possible because the government needed to borrow and to do this it had to take account of the Banks' conditions⁽¹⁵¹⁾. The sharpest criticism however was reserved for the Banque de France, which Vendredi condemned for using its financial power to achieve political objectives. The Banque de France was accused of printing money for the government of Pierre Laval⁽¹⁵²⁾, which Flandin claimed it put in power after bringing down his own cabinet in 1935⁽¹⁵³⁾. Not surprisingly therefore, the reform of the Banque de France by the Front Populaire was seen as inadequate, although unusually this criticism was made by a shareholder and not by Vendredi's directors⁽¹⁵⁴⁾.

What was interesting about Vendredi's wider economic views was the almost exclusive reliance on the C.G.T., which was given an effective monopoly on the presentation of economic ideas in the paper. This was the result of the directors' decision in June 1936 to pay greater attention to social and economic problems, by inviting Léon Jouhaux and other C.G.T. members to collaborate on the paper⁽¹⁵⁵⁾. It seems surprising however that a paper devoted to serving the Front Populaire should have seen fit to give the C.G.T. so much influence in economic matters. One possible reason was that Léon Jouhaux, the leader of the C.G.T. - like the majority of the leadership at that time, resisted any party political affiliations since as Georges Lefranc claims, he retained "de (son) formation libertaire un mépris persistant à l'égard des Partis"⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. This independence meant that by publishing C.G.T. opinions, Vendredi could not be seen as favouring the economic doctrines of any one party. In an open letter to Vendredi of the 12th June 1936

Léon Jouhaux welcomed the paper's invitation to him and the creation of a special regular page, the "Forces du Travail, Idées Vivantes". He also declared his intention to use the page to put forward syndicalist concepts and stated the outlines of the C.G.T.'s economic policy: opposition to deflation, a call for an increase in the spending power of consumers and a public works programme⁽¹⁵⁷⁾. In July 1936 Jouhaux again wrote in Vendredi to welcome the impending nationalisation of the munitions factories - something the C.G.T. first proposed in a report to the League of Nations in 1921⁽¹⁵⁸⁾. Nationalisation however, did not in Robert Lacoste's view mean "étatisation" but rather a form of co-operative ownership, with worker and consumer representatives on the board⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. During the strikes of June 1936 the C.G.T. as represented in Vendredi, took the view that the strikes were a warning to the government to introduce reforms immediately⁽¹⁶⁰⁾, but by August of that year René Belin called for a return to work, mindful of the damage to the economy⁽¹⁶¹⁾. This call was later taken up by Léon Jouhaux⁽¹⁶²⁾, who emphasised in his article that during the period of "les revendications sociales" the C.G.T. never forgot the national interest⁽¹⁶³⁾. Jouhaux's attitude towards the strikes and occupations of 1936 represented the view of Vendredi, but the paper's policy at this time was evidently to steer clear of any controversy in this area by largely ignoring the industrial problems of the summer of 1936. Of the more general economic ideas expressed by the C.G.T. in Vendredi the most important include credit controls⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ and rational economic planning of the economy⁽¹⁶⁵⁾, but the overriding concern was economic recovery⁽¹⁶⁶⁾. Since

Vendredi relied so heavily on the C.G.T. for its economic ideas, the result was a practical rather than an ideological approach to economic problems. Consequently the fall of the Franc was seen as worrying. An unsigned major article of the 8th October 1937 and an article by Paul Gérin of the 25th February 1938 placed the blame for this on the doctrine of gold convertibility and the export of capital⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. What was quite remarkable however was that at a time of financial crisis Vendredi distanced itself from Left-wing economic views, when its editorial of the 24th December 1937 condemned the government for excessive borrowing⁽¹⁶⁸⁾. This appeared to be the result of panic over the inability of the economy to recover⁽¹⁶⁹⁾, because on April 1938 Vendredi again called for radical measures⁽¹⁷⁰⁾. Vendredi's concern with practical economic policies was not only due to the syndicalist bias in its approach, but was also a reflection of the fact that the Front Populaire was an alliance of the working and middle classes. Guéhenno certainly saw the alliance in this light and approved of Blum's speech to the Expo workers, where there was mention of "nous-ouvriers, paysans, petits patrons, fonctionnaires"⁽¹⁷¹⁾. Léon Jouhaux shared this view and was particularly concerned with attempts by the Far Right to detach the middle classes from the alliance⁽¹⁷²⁾. Even more importantly F. Delaisi wrote a series of articles in Vendredi, where he emphasised the credits voted by the Front Populaire to aid small businesses⁽¹⁷³⁾. The importance of agricultural workers to the Front Populaire was also reflected in Vendredi. An article by Marcel Braibant drew attention to the exploitation of farmers by sugar refiners and urged farmers to unite in their own interests⁽¹⁷⁴⁾.

It is clear that because the Front Populaire and Vendredi served a wide range of economic interests, its economic policy was reformist rather than revolutionary, and that the only real point of agreement was the hatred of the big capitalist monopolies, which was common to all the parties. Articles in Vendredi therefore supported the nationalisation of credit and the key industries, in order to break the power of these monopolies⁽¹⁷⁵⁾. At the same time Vendredi remained committed to liberal economics and pump-priming of the economy. In the early days of the Front Populaire experiment especially, the government was encouraged to expand credit on a massive scale⁽¹⁷⁶⁾. The intention was to stimulate the economy and prevent capitalism's worst excesses, but not to make radical changes. Léon Jouhaux saw the move to an "économie dirigée" as a last resort⁽¹⁷⁷⁾, whilst G. Duveau saw Proudhon as well as Marx, as the precursors of the Front Populaire's economic policy⁽¹⁷⁸⁾. Vendredi did welcome news of economic planning by the government, but this was done in a very late editorial, when economic views became increasingly confused and moreover, what was understood by planning was government aid to business to stimulate production⁽¹⁷⁹⁾. Finally the appeal to moral values in relation to economics, which was very characteristic of Vendredi is worth noting. Paul Gérin drew attention to the national pastime of tax evasion and the morally reprehensible maxim that: "en finance comme en amour, trompe qui peut"⁽¹⁸⁰⁾.

Although the political and economic ideas and problems of the Front Populaire were important, the reforms introduced during

this period were not confined to just these areas, but also affected education, women and youth. Paul Gérin welcomed the structural reforms of the education system, such as the proposed creation of an "École d'Administration", which would "assurer un recrutement élargi à la base"⁽¹⁸¹⁾. Vendredi however, wanted a more general opening-up of the "Grandes Écoles" to "le peuple... qui porte l'ardent désir de culture et d'élévation en soi-même"⁽¹⁸²⁾. As a result the Education bill of minister Jean Zay was criticised by André Delmas, because it did not envisage an extension of the grants system, which was essential if poor students were to be encouraged to study⁽¹⁸³⁾. The C.G.T. was particularly worried by the bias of education towards bourgeois needs and called for a national ruling committee of educational experts and representatives of "les intérêts généraux" to supervise the system⁽¹⁸⁴⁾. Contemporary education was sharply criticised by C. Freinet, who claimed the curriculum was irrelevant to the child's needs, but even more importantly the school system was condemned for destroying the ability to think critically⁽¹⁸⁵⁾. Nevertheless criticism was only part of Vendredi's concern. A vision of what education should become in the future was given in an account by Paul Gérin of a model school in Suresnes. The school was a model in architectural terms: The classrooms were built as glass pavilions full of flowers, where stairs had been replaced by ramps for safety reasons. The teaching methods reflected this progressive approach: Academic lessons were intermixed with sports sessions and punishments as well as prizes were banned. The academic successes of this school justified its progressive approach, hence Gérin concluded

that "le travail dans la joie et la liberté (est) meilleur que le surmonage dans la contrainte"⁽¹⁸⁶⁾. Such progressive views were an important aspect of Vendredi, but their importance was undermined by the articles of Edmond Schlesinger, the regular contributor of articles on educational matters. Schlesinger's views included the classification of delinquent children as medical problems⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ - a far from liberal attitude which assumed that all children must conform to a single system. His general approach was moralistic in the extreme. Articles by him urged parents and teachers to fight against the tendency among children to admire famous criminals⁽¹⁸⁸⁾, although to his credit he also advocated sex instruction and criticised one manual which implied that the sex organs could only be used in marriage⁽¹⁸⁹⁾.

The problems of women were initially catered for by Vendredi by means of a separate page entitled "Vendredi de la Femme". This in itself raises certain problems. It is possible to argue that relegating women to a separate page constituting 1/15th of the paper denies women equal status with men. Nonetheless it is also true that excessive integration is equally offensive, because it implies that women must give up their qualities as women, in order to become accepted as "people". Vendredi ran a separate women's page for the first eighteen issues and after that time integrated women's problems within the body of the paper. For as long as the page format was adhered to, women did tend to be treated as housewives with the main emphasis of the page being on fashion⁽¹⁹⁰⁾. Articles on more substantial issues such as marriage law⁽¹⁹¹⁾ and the problems of working mothers⁽¹⁹²⁾ were

included, but were not given great prominence until the women's page was discontinued. Andrée Viollis declined to use the women's page when she appealed for votes for women. In an article of the 28th February 1936 referring to Spanish women who used their votes to elect the Frente Popular, she denied that women were natural reactionaries, saying: "(les femmes espagnoles) ont appris, avec une incroyable rapidité, leurs droits et leurs devoirs civiques"⁽¹⁹³⁾. Andrée Viollis repeated this argument in a second article in which she welcomed the nomination of three women ministers⁽¹⁹⁴⁾. Wider representation of women in the unions was a problem tackled by Germaine Robert-Castro, who stated that "les femmes, éléments actifs de production doivent être aussi éléments actifs d'organisations syndicales"⁽¹⁹⁵⁾. The very difficult problem of divorce was treated professionally in Vendredi by Collette Aynard-Thumen, who drew attention to the inadequacy of the law, which required divorcing couples to accuse each other of adultery in court⁽¹⁹⁶⁾. Clearly with respect to women, Vendredi raised feminist issues which dated back to late nineteenth century socialism. The reference to marriage law in particular, invokes the views of Léon Blum's Du Mariage. This is because in this book Blum questions the value of monogamy, advocating instead a more liberal approach to marriage. His view that women should have total control over their bodies⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ and that illegitimate children should be financially supported by the state⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ stands in sharp contrast to the outdated practices of the French legal system. One female issue to which a surprisingly large amount of space was devoted by Vendredi was prostitution. As in-depth study of

the problem by Magdeleine Paz appeared in the form of full-page articles over six consecutive issues⁽¹⁹⁹⁾. Its chief conclusion - that brothels should be closed - was not however as important as the reasons for which the directors commissioned the study. Chamson remembers asking Magdeleine Paz to write her series of articles, because "nous avions, par les documents... pris conscience du fait que les meilleurs soutiens du fascisme étaient les trois quarts du temps les maquereaux des maisons de tolérance et nous avons décidé d'en finir avec ces maisons"⁽²⁰⁰⁾.

With respect to youth, Chamson, perhaps because he wrote his article sitting next to Guéhenno, who at that time was reading La légende dorée, urged diversity among youth, saying: "soyez différents"⁽²⁰¹⁾. Nonetheless youth in Vendredi were presented as Left-wing activists and pacifists, with a passion for outdoor activities. This surely reflected the moves of the government, which created a "sous-secrétariat d'État aux sports et aux loisirs" under Léo Lagrange and encouraged the Auberges de jeunesse⁽²⁰²⁾, rather than the true picture of French youth. Chamson went as far as to claim that French youth as a whole supported both the Front Populaire and the Auberges. Furthermore he gave a bronzed muscled youth as the most appropriate image of the Front Populaire⁽²⁰³⁾. As a result articles by him devoted to youth supported government initiatives, concentrating on the Auberges movement⁽²⁰⁴⁾ and camping⁽²⁰⁵⁾. An appeal to youth to resist war and change the world was made by Louis Guilloux, who claimed that "être jeune, c'est tout pouvoir"⁽²⁰⁶⁾. The pacifist theme was continued by André Hoschiller in his account of the

First World Youth Congress of September 1936. Referring to the congress' declaration in support of peace, he stated: "(la jeunesse) sait qu'elle n'est jamais le vainqueur mais le triste vaincu de la guerre, la victime assurée"⁽²⁰⁷⁾. At the time of the Paris Exhibition of 1937, the only contribution by the young noted by Vendredi was a festival organised by the Mouvement du Congrès Mondial de la Jeunesse⁽²⁰⁸⁾.

Although the Front Populaire reforms did not affect the Church, the influence of the chief editor Louis Martin-Chauffier, resulted in several articles in the subject. In June 1936 he paid tribute to Cardinal Verdier and reminded Catholics that the Church did not impose any political doctrine on them⁽²⁰⁹⁾. Later he condemned clericalism, because he believed political choices should not be mixed up with religion⁽²¹⁰⁾. Of direct relevance to the Front Populaire was Martin-Chauffier's view, which was taken from Cardinal Verdier, that the Pope supported co-operation with the communists. Martin-Chauffier welcomed this co-operation: "que la bonne foi des communistes soit admise, que la collaboration avec eux soit autorisée, c'est déjà un immense progrès"⁽²¹¹⁾. Significantly however, he preferred to dwell on the interpretation of the Pope's private views given to Cardinal Verdier, rather than on the Papal Encyclica Divini Redemptoris, which he himself admitted was a blow to those seeking co-operation with communists⁽²¹²⁾. The attitude of the Pope received further attention from Vendredi at the time of the bombing of Guernica, during the Spanish Civil War. Andrée Viollis called on the Pope to speak out, while Françoise Lassagne quoted the view of François Mauriac in

Le Figaro, where the latter claimed that the Pope could stop the bombing, because Franco was a believer⁽²¹³⁾.

Because Vendredi appeared at a time of great international tension and since its directors shared an internationalist outlook, it was to be expected that the paper should devote a great deal of space to foreign affairs, with a particular emphasis on foreign policy. Given that Vendredi saw the origins of world instability in the Treaty of Versailles and the break-up of the League of Nations, the paper therefore devoted considerable attention to the direct actions of Germany and Italy. The most comprehensive account of the origins of world crisis was put forward by Guéhenno, who repeatedly stated the view that Versailles was a mistake⁽²¹⁴⁾. He also claimed that attempts to rectify the mistake by Aristide Briand came too late⁽²¹⁵⁾, because his earlier efforts were thwarted by Poincaré's invasion of the Ruhr⁽²¹⁶⁾. Louis Martin-Chauffier drew the conclusion that French policies led directly to Hitler's coming to power⁽²¹⁷⁾. The first major European crisis however, had more to do with misguided French behaviour rather than with any foreign menace to France. The crisis over Ethiopia was the first major threat to European security and Vendredi devoted more space and attention to this, than to any other subsequent crisis with the exception of the Czech. The Ethiopian crisis had its origins in an agreement between Pierre Laval and Mussolini, giving Mussolini a free hand in Ethiopia in return for Italian help in preserving the independence of Austria⁽²¹⁸⁾. For Vendredi however, principles were at stake here: Ethiopia's right to independence had to be defended, as well as peace in Europe. Furthermore peace had to be

defended universally through the League of Nations, hence the rejection of Laval's approach. Because at root both Laval and Vendredi wanted French security, their argument was over the methods to be used, and consequently Ethiopia became a party political rather than a national issue. This being the case Pierre Laval, rather than Mussolini, became the villain of the peace. The directors wrote an open letter reminding him that the League of Nations pact was the best guarantee of French security⁽²¹⁹⁾, and Andrée Viollis warned of the dire consequences for the League, of the Hoare-Laval proposal. This proposal of January 1936, which involved the partitioning of Ethiopia⁽²²⁰⁾ was condemned by Andrée Viollis because it attacked the basic principles of the League⁽²²¹⁾. In an article of the 10th January 1936 Guéhenno openly accused Laval of prolonging the war in Ethiopia by not applying sanctions⁽²²²⁾, whilst Louis Martin-Chauffier accused him of high treason over his conduct during the Ethiopian crisis⁽²²³⁾. The view that Laval destroyed the League of Nations is shared by René Albrecht-Carrié⁽²²⁴⁾, although he does not accept Vendredi's view that Laval conspired to re-arm Germany⁽²²⁵⁾. With hindsight the Ethiopian crisis was seen by Vendredi as the beginning of the slide towards war⁽²²⁶⁾ - all the more regrettable because it could have been avoided. At the same time the paper was quick to point out the consequences of the Ethiopian crisis for France. The impotence of the League of Nations was only one result of French policy⁽²²⁷⁾. The threat to Austria⁽²²⁸⁾ and a general loss of confidence in France by its allies, were also seen as the price of Laval's policy⁽²²⁹⁾.

This last view is supported by René Albrecht-Carrié, who believes that beginning in 1935, French dominance in Europe by treaties and diplomacy breaks down⁽²³⁾. An even more serious consequence of Ethiopia noted by Vendredi was the subsequent paralysis of French foreign policy⁽²³¹⁾ and its subservience to British opinion⁽²³²⁾. This was seen as regrettable because British Foreign policy was itself misguided. The editorial of the 3rd December 1937 rejected the proposed British idea of a "Pacte à quatre" between France, Britain, Germany and Italy, because it was likely to push Central Europe into German hands. The editorial quoted an American journalist, who said: "les démocraties ne semblent jamais aussi étroitement unies que lorsqu'elles s'entendent pour céder"⁽²³³⁾. Vendredi also expressed its regret when Britain negotiated with Italy over Spain without French participation. The paper correctly predicted that France would be expected to rubber-stamp the British decisions⁽²³⁴⁾.

In contrast to Ethiopia, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland received minimal coverage in Vendredi. Legally speaking Hitler's actions amounted to an act of war⁽²³⁵⁾ and the French could have reacted with force⁽²³⁶⁾, irrespective of British opinion. Such considerations did not however impress Vendredi, which reacted to the crisis by publishing a statement by the C.V.I.A.-F. Point Seven of this statement called for France to renounce the use of force and resolve the problem before an international tribunal⁽²³⁷⁾. Chamson, in a major article on the crisis of the 20th March 1936 condemned Germany for breaking the freely-

signed Locarno treaty, but rejected the use of force in the Rhineland. Furthermore he dismissed the importance of the crisis by claiming that the real problem was not remilitarisation, but German rearmament. The question therefore was whether to fight a preventive war, a proposal which Chamson rejected as absurd: "suicidons-nous pour éviter la mort"⁽²³⁸⁾. It is worth noting that although Vendredi opposed the use of force in the Rhineland, it did not approve of French inaction on international matters. A front-page article by André Wurmser of the 15th May 1936 claimed that failure to apply economic sanctions on Italy over Ethiopia, led directly to Hitler's remilitarisation of the Rhineland⁽²³⁹⁾.

When Hitler invaded Austria in March 1938 Vendredi reacted with resignation. Its editorial of the 31st December 1937 already envisaged such a possibility, when it condemned Britain for encouraging German expansion into Austria and the Sudetenland⁽²⁴⁰⁾. When the Anschluss became a reality, it attracted little more than a passing reference in Vendredi, because it coincided with an internal political crisis involving Blum's attempt to form a second cabinet. In the event more concern was expressed over the consequences of the Anschluss for Czechlovakia, with which France had a treaty, than with the immediate repercussions for the Austrians⁽²⁴¹⁾. An article by Andrée Viollis giving an eye-witness account of events in Vienna during the fall of Austria was Vendredi's only substantial account of the Anschluss. The article concluded with a reproach: "cette affreuse tragédie, n'en portons-nous pas, pour une bonne part, la responsabilité?"⁽²⁴²⁾.

Although the Anschluss was accepted by Vendredi with relative ease, the resulting threat to Czechoslovakia became a major problem for the paper. The editorial of the 24th April 1938 referred to Henlein's demands for autonomy in the Sudetenland as "l'égitiment inadmissibles au gouvernement de Prague", and it noted the increasing concern of Britain⁽²⁴³⁾. Andrée Viollis referred to Czechoslovakia as "(un pays) menacé qui attend avec angoisse"⁽²⁴⁴⁾, while Chamson believed that the situation in that country "permet toutes les inquiétudes"⁽²⁴⁵⁾. Clearly Chamson was worried by the Czech problem, but he apparently took Foreign Minister Paul-Boncour's affirmation of support for Czechoslovakia⁽²⁴⁶⁾ at face value. In a major article of the 27th May 1938 he therefore warned the Germans that any recourse to violence "se heurterait à l'inébranlable fermeté de ceux-là mêmes qui désiraient la conciliation"⁽²⁴⁷⁾. The truth, according to Léon Noël, was that France had no intention of honouring her treaty obligations towards the Czechs⁽²⁴⁸⁾. The basic attitude of Vendredi in the months leading up to Munich, was one of firm support of the Czechs. In a major article of the 15th July 1938 Philippe Diolé claimed that Hitler was about to invade on the 21st May, but changed his mind in the face of French declarations of support for Czechoslovakia. This is why Diolé urged the French to stay loyal to their ally and resist any weakening of the strategic Sudetenland frontier⁽²⁴⁹⁾. Diolé's views were later taken up in two major unsigned articles of September 1938. The second of these articles justified the call for firmness with Hitler by claiming that Hitler "ne veut pas la guerre... toute action qu'il mène n'est qu'un vaste bluffe"⁽²⁵⁰⁾. Since Vendredi took a pro-Czech view before

Munich, it was to to be expected that the Munich accords would receive a luke-warm reception. The paper's editorial of the 30th September presented Munich as a diplomatic coup for Germany⁽²⁵¹⁾, whilst the following week an unsigned article paid tribute to the Czechs : "Prague a accepté de se sacrifier pour la paix d'Europe"⁽²⁵²⁾. Nonetheless Vendredi's editorial of the 7th October welcomed the accords as a possible first step towards permanent security⁽²⁵³⁾. This more positive reaction certainly reflected Guéhenno's views: In a letter to his friend Jean Blanzat, written immediately after Munich he said: "la guerre est maintenant impossible. (Hitler) va nous foutre maintenant la paix"⁽²⁵⁴⁾. The division of opinion over Munich within Vendredi was a reflection of the internal divisions in all the political parties on the peace issue, after September 1938⁽²⁵⁵⁾.

What is very clear, is that the twin aims of Vendredi's foreign policy were world peace and respect for the rights of other nations. This was best seen in the paper's editorial on the eve of Munich: "Construire la paix européenne: oui... rayer la Tchécoslovaquie de la carte de l'Europe: non"⁽²⁵⁶⁾. Since both demands were seen as having equal importance, the paper wanted firmness in the face of foreign fascist demands. In practical terms this meant using economic pressure against fascist governments, hence Vendredi's support for sanctions against Italy during the Ethiopian crisis. In later crises the paper called for economic pressure to be put on Germany⁽²⁶⁷⁾, Brazil⁽²⁵⁸⁾, Japan⁽²⁵⁹⁾ and Italy⁽²⁶⁰⁾. It must be stressed

however, that by supporting firmness towards fascism, Vendredi was not supporting the use of force. Firmness was therefore a somewhat vague term, although an important one, because it characterised the whole of the paper's foreign policy. Its ambivalent nature did however, lead to very real problems, of which the most serious was the confused attitude towards Spain.

Spain initially attracted Vendredi's attention with the election of the Frente Popular government, at which time Andrée Viollis praised the non-violent nature of the government's reforms and noted, its leniency towards Right-wing generals like Franco⁽²⁶¹⁾. Viollis' view, according to Madeleine Berry, was shared by Guéhenno and Chamson, "qui dès le début... ont été du côté de la République"⁽²⁶²⁾, The first events of the Civil War were therefore immediately reported in Vendredi. A front-page article by André Wurmser of the 24th July 1936 gave an account of the revolt of the colonial officers and criticised the republican government for being "trop indulgent". Furthermore it drew parallels between government tolerance of the hostile behaviour of banks in Spain and in France, thereby interpreting the events in Spain as a warning to the French Left. The article also drew attention to the pro-fascist attitude of the Right-wing press both in Madrid and in Paris⁽²⁶³⁾. On the 31st July H. Pasamonte's article gave a detailed account of events in Spain, beginning with the assassination by fascists of Lt. Castillo on the night of the 12th July. G. Pasamonte took a pessimistic view, and was frank about the early fascist successes including the fall

of Seville, Cadiz, Aragon and Navarre⁽²⁶⁴⁾. This early pessimism soon gave way to a more positive assessment of the Republic's fighting potential. In the course of a month-long visit to Spain in September 1936, Andrée Viollis wrote for Vendredi, stressing the calm normality of Madrid and the high morale of the troops on the Guadarrama front. Most importantly she concluded that the Republic would win, because "rien ne pfevaut contre la volonté du peuple"⁽²⁶⁵⁾. At the same time Elie Richard gave the paper a historical account of the role of the Spanish military establishment since 1932, the behaviour of the Monarchist leader of the Social Christians Gil Robles, and the attempts to overthrow the Frente Popular in the months after the elections of February 1936⁽²⁶⁶⁾. A measure of the importance Vendredi attached to Spain was the assignation of page three to the problem on a regular basis, beginning with the issue of the 7th August 1936. The decision to give such prominence to a problem over which there was disagreement within the Front Populaire was an exception to the paper's usual policy of ignoring or glossing over issues problematic to the alliance. Spain was therefore in Alain Decaux's view, the issue which caused ultimately fatal problems for Vendredi⁽²⁶⁷⁾.

A very important argument put forward by Vendredi from the start of the Spanish Civil War, was that foreign powers were involved behind generals Franco and Sanjurjo. Angel Galarza's article of the 7th August 1936 drew attention to the generals' pro-German stance in the First World War, as well as to the role of Juan March, a rich trader who set up a supply base for

German submarines at that time. Galarza claimed March was now financing the generals' rebellion. More direct evidence of German involvement in the rebellion provided by Galarza, was the trip to Germany by Gen. Sanjurjo on the eve of the revolt and the confession of Hilda Hoog that she was an "agent de liaison" between rebel general Mola and the Germans⁽²⁶⁸⁾.

Six months later Vendredi exposed the presence of Germans in Spanish Morocco, stressing the importance of the fact that Germany now controlled Moroccan mineral resources⁽²⁶⁹⁾.

The most decisive influence on Vendredi's attitude to Spain was André Chamson, because it was his articles which stated the paper's main arguments on the matter. As early as August 1936 he claimed that the war in Spain was an Italian and German adventure. Chamson gave the presence of German and Italian aeroplanes in Spanish Morocco as proof of international fascist involvement. He therefore argued that the Republicans were defending France's security on its southern border against a German and Italian threat⁽²⁷⁰⁾. Consequently Chamson opposed abandoning Spain⁽²⁷¹⁾ and condemned "la duperie de la non-intervention"⁽²⁷²⁾. In so doing he also redefined pacifism as a will to prevent future violence, rather than as a revolt in the face of existing violence⁽²⁷³⁾. Later, in January 1938, after the Republic's victory at Teruel, he urged all pacifists to rejoice at this military success⁽²⁷⁴⁾. When German and Italian forces intervened directly in the fighting, Chamson disputed the use of the term "civil war". Instead he argued that "c'est la lutte entre le monde civil et le monde militaire"⁽²⁷⁵⁾.

This "monde militaire" was international in scope, but irrelevant to all except its leaders. Chamson claimed that the Germans who fought in Spain had nothing in common with their Italian and Spanish fellow-combatants⁽²⁷⁶⁾. The view that the war in Spain was a pure war fought for its own sake, was also implicit in Chamson's book on Spain, Retour d'Espagne of 1937, "où l'on ne trouve aucun récit sur des horreurs précises mais, essentiellement le procès de la guerre en soi"⁽²⁷⁷⁾. This view was not however, shared by A.A., whose article for Vendredi claimed that Italy became involved for economic reasons. He saw the presence of Italian workers in the gathering of the olive harvest as evidence that Italy was hoping to derive economic benefits from its military involvement⁽²⁷⁸⁾.

Vendredi's sympathy for the Spanish Republic had unfortunate repercussions for the objectivity of its reports. The earliest accounts excepted, there was a strong tendency towards excessive optimism. In March 1937 Andrée Viollis accepted that in November 1936 with fascists at the gates of Madrid, the situation seemed doomed, but she dismissed any thoughts of despair with the argument that Madrid was still resisting⁽²⁷⁹⁾. In December 1937 Malraux published his account of the Republican victory at Guadalajara⁽²⁸⁰⁾, but this was a battle which took place some eight months earlier. Malraux's account was however published in the same issue as an editorial which claimed that the fascists were unlikely to win the Civil War⁽²⁸¹⁾. Although over-optimistic, Vendredi's attitude to the various Left-wing parties fighting in Spain was objective and very even-handed. The paper made no

attempt to hide the fact that in Gerona, on the 21st July 1936 Church furniture was burnt⁽²⁸²⁾, and that similar events occurred in Barcelona - a fact reported by Belgian deputy Louis Pierard⁽²⁸³⁾. Of even greater significance was an article by Carlo Rosselli, which appeared in November 1936 in defence of the Catalonian anarchists. Rosselli presented the anarchists as being very reasonable realistic people and he claimed that their reputation abroad for destructive behaviour was totally unjustified⁽²⁸⁴⁾. This view conflicted with the communist interpretation of the situation in Barcelona. Ilya Ehrenbourg for example, in his Men, Years - Life, paints a picture of dissaray in Catalonia, claiming that the anarchists refused to recognise the Madrid government and that they were infiltrated by criminal elements⁽²⁸⁵⁾. The opposing viewpoints of commentators like Rosselli and Ehrenbourg are synthesised by Noam Chomsky in American power and the new mandarins. Chomsky refutes the more extreme communist charges against the anarchists, but he justifies their general counter-revolutionary policy, claiming that:

"the Communist-led counter-revolutionary struggle must, of course be understood against the background of the ongoing antifascist war and the more general attempt of the Soviet Union to construct a broad antifascist alliance with the Western democracies"⁽²⁸⁶⁾.

In the final analysis however, Vendredi maintained a balance by ignoring the very serious divisions among the Spanish republicans. There was therefore no mention of the fighting between the Communists and the Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista (P.O.U.M.). in Barcelona, which George Orwell witnessed and which he describes

in Homage to Catalonia. Orwell does not hesitate to claim that "the Communist Party with Soviet Russia behind it, had thrown its whole weight against the revolution"⁽²⁸⁷⁾, and that "the Communist Party was the chief mover first against the P.O.U.M., later against the Anarchists and against Caballero's section of the Socialists"⁽²⁸⁸⁾. His conclusion, summarised by Bruno de Cessole as: "une "cause juste" peut avoir d'indigne défenseurs et qu'une révolution peut être trahie par les siens"⁽²⁸⁹⁾. was entirely alien to Vendredi.

An interesting aspect of Vendredi's attitude to Spain was its presentation of the war from a French patriotic, rather than a party political viewpoint. The main reason for this was the foreign intervention in Spain, which the paper presented as a threat to France's southern border. The resulting argument that the Spanish cause was simultaneously the French cause, was first formulated by Chamson and later taken up by other commentators. In August 1936 Jean-Richard Bloch stated that the Spanish republic was fighting for the interests of France, because a fascist victory would involve German and Italian control of Spanish naval bases. He also claimed that a fascist victory would make it impossible to defend the French African Empire⁽²⁹⁰⁾. In October 1936 Vendredi's editorial condemned the French government's neutrality over Spain as an "attentat à la liberté". This editorial also stressed that support of the Spanish republic was vital in France's national interest⁽²⁹¹⁾. The consequence of this view was the rejection of the Front Populaire government's official policy of non-intervention. Chamson recalls that

"à Vendredi nous étions en majorité pour l'intervention"⁽²⁹²⁾.

The paper's articles indeed support this opinion. In October 1936 Louis Martin-Chauffier described the London committee for the co-ordination of non-interventionary measures as a "trompe d'oeil" body designed to evade issues, not solve them⁽²⁹³⁾.

Paul Nizan in an article of April 1937 took the view that the control of non-intervention was a farce, because only the French border was closed⁽²⁹⁴⁾. Victor Basch, President of the Rassemblement Populaire, wrote in May 1937 to condemn Blum's policy. He did not deny that this policy averted World War, but stressed its costs: Rome and Berlin had united, Austria had been invaded, Belgium neutralised and Yugoslavia as well as Rumania had seen fit to weaken their links with France⁽²⁹⁵⁾.

Andrée Viollis joined in the condemnation of non-intervention, describing it in June 1937 as "la plus monstrueuse hypocrisie"⁽²⁹⁶⁾.

The only major dissenting voice on this issue was Guéhenno.

In July 1937 he presented the Spanish Civil War as "un drame personnel". He described his attitude in the context of an aversion to violence, resulting from the First World War:

"il y a au fond des hommes de mon âge une masse de souvenirs paralysants... et cela peut bien nous donner... un air de lâcheté". Refusing to choose between the Spanish Revolution and peace, he stated that non-intervention "a été l'expression de notre propre désarroi". Nonetheless he continued to believe that this policy could save both Spain and world peace⁽²⁹⁷⁾.

When large scale aerial bombing took place in Spain, Vendredi's commentators saw it as a consequence of earlier French

inaction. Léon Jouhaux, returning from Spain in May 1937, called for international measures to stop the massacres of civilians and for the democracies to step in to aid the Republic, if foreign forces did not withdraw⁽²⁹⁸⁾. Vendredi's editorial of February 1938 stated unequivocally that the massacres in Barcelona were the result of French and British weakness towards Italy and Germany in times past⁽²⁹⁹⁾. Since French foreign policy was quite clearly following the British lead, it was British policies which were most strongly attacked in Vendredi. Andrée Viollis criticised the British ban on food shipments to the besieged port of Bilbao in May 1937⁽³⁰⁰⁾. In November Vendredi's editorial condemned the British government's talks with an official representative of Gen. Franco⁽³⁰¹⁾, while an editorial of March 1938 attacked Chamberlain's willingness to forget Spain and sign an accord with the fascist states⁽³⁰²⁾.

Although there was general agreement on Vendredi that non-intervention was ineffective, there was less agreement on what should replace it. In July 1937 Vendredi suggested international control of non-intervention: "la frontière française demeurera fermée, simplement, elle ne sera plus contrôlée toute seule"⁽³⁰³⁾. In September of that year it suggested that the League of Nations should solve the problem⁽³⁰⁴⁾. Such a solution was proposed earlier in December 1936 by Léon Jouhaux, who also warned against the danger of France being isolated on the Spanish issue⁽³⁰⁵⁾. The only concrete proposal was made in an unsigned article of October 1937. This called for the implementation of the decision to reopen the Franco-Spanish border, given the lack of any

agreement on non-intervention with Italy and Germany⁽³⁰⁶⁾. In the face of disagreement on Spain Vendredi launched an initiative of its own which was non-controversial and found support: An appeal for humanitarian aid, launched in the issue of the 7th August 1936, was the first instance of French help to the Republicans. Chamson recalls with pride, that "nous avons été les premiers à envoyer à nos camarades... le soutien"⁽³⁰⁷⁾. Madeleine Berry confirms that "le premier camion qui arrive à Barcelone chargé de médicaments (portait) une grande banderole "Envoi du journal Vendredi"⁽³⁰⁸⁾.

The consequences of Spain were of particular significance for Vendredi, which for so long backed the Republic. Morality in international relations was an early casualty of the conflict⁽³⁰⁹⁾, rules governing the conduct of war were another. It is somewhat ironic that a defence of total war was made by Louis Martin-Chauffier in the wake of the bombing of Guernica. In an article of June 1937, he stated: "la guerre totale... est la seule guerre logique". Believing there to be no difference between the killing of soldiers and that of civilians, he launched an attack on those wishing to "humanise" war. He condemned such people as defenders of war and dismissed the outcry over Guernica as hypocritical⁽³¹⁰⁾. On a more mundane level, the war in Spain marked the end of Vendredi's expansion and the start of its decline⁽³¹¹⁾. In giving its backing to the communist argument against non-intervention⁽³¹²⁾, but stopping short of a call for military action, Vendredi disappointed both the communists and the other Front Populaire parties, although it did reflect the

personal anguish of Prime Minister Léon Blum. Nonetheless by rejecting non-intervention whilst at the same time demanding its firm application, Vendredi also failed to present a credible policy.

Since Vendredi regarded Italy and Germany as the main instigators of crises in Europe, the presentation of these states by the paper deserves more detailed attention. The main charge against Italy was the opportunism of its Foreign policy. Paul Louis justified his allegations with such examples as Italy joining the Entente in 1915 after failing to negotiate a profitable agreement with Germany, and the deployment of its army on the Brenner immediately after the 1934 accord with Germany⁽³¹³⁾. This view of Italian policy was also that of Léon Noël⁽³¹⁴⁾. Opportunism was not a fascist invention, but Mussolini was moreover accused of international terror. Vendredi was the first paper to accuse Italy of involvement in the Louis Barthou assassination, by revealing in its second issue, that the arms used were of Italian and German origin. Italian co-operation over the extradition of the assassins was dismissed by A. Dutheil, the author of this article, as a move designed to alloy suspicion⁽³¹⁵⁾. A. Dutheil's views were later supported by Chamson in September 1937, when he accused the totalitarian states in general and Italy in particular, of carrying out terrorist acts in France. The Barthou assassination, the Clichy events, the bombing of aeroplanes and the bomb attack on the Employers Headquarters, were all given as examples⁽³¹⁶⁾. With respect to Mussolini's internal policies, Julien Benda

denied the Duce's claim that fascist Italy was a great civilisation, stating instead that it was no more than a military establishment, closed to art⁽³¹⁷⁾. On the 9th September 1938 Louis Martin-Chauffier published an open letter to Mussolini on the question of the persecution of Italian Jews⁽³¹⁸⁾. An unsigned article in the same issue explained the anti-semitic policy as an attempt by the regime to divert public opinion from internal difficulties, and "surtout à favoriser la propagande italienne en Palestine"⁽³¹⁹⁾. The real aim therefore was to impress the Moslems in the East Mediterranean. Despite the fact that Vendredi classified Italy and Germany as totalitarian, such a classification of Italy is open to dispute. Philippe Viet believes Italian fascism "est en réalité un pouvoir personnel... qui dans le domaine politique, a exercé à l'encontre de ses opposants une répression minime... Mussolino... ne prétendait pas changer l'essence de l'homme"⁽³²⁰⁾.

In contrast to Italy, Claude Polin gives Nazi Germany as an example of a totalitarian state, because of its glorification of "l'homo mediocris" and its pursuit of the totalitarian ideal: "le vrai totalitarisme commence lorsque l'individu devient indiscernable du tout, en d'abord de celui qui est censé d'incarner l'unité"⁽³²¹⁾. Interest in Germany's home affairs is characteristic of Vendredi's approach to the country. Andrée Viollis' report from Berlin of January 1936 painted a grim picture of high prices and low wages. Furthermore Viollis referred to the persecution of the Left and estimated that 80,000 people had become victims of the regime⁽³²²⁾. In April 1936 she drew attention to the trial for treason of former Communist Party

leader Thaelmann. Her article exposed the violation of the legal system by the Nazis and stressed the moderate views of the accused⁽³²³⁾. In May 1937 Charles Reber wrote of further abuses of the system. This time four leaders of the Catholic youth in the Rhineland were being tried for treason, for collaborating with communists against the Nazi dictatorship. Fearing the political consequences, the regime this time decided to drop the charges against the chief accused Rossaint, by using a psychiatrist to declare him insane⁽³²⁴⁾. Of even greater importance are Vendredi's reports of Nazi anti-semitism. Louis Martin-Chauffier wrote in January 1937 to present the view that this was an attempt by the regime to distract attention from the fact that: "(ce régime) n'a rien su construire que la misère et la contrainte". With reference to Elvira Bauer's anti-semitic pictures, Martin-Chauffier also noted the simultaneous contempt of the regime for its German people. This was because in the face of the alleged Jewish vice the Germans were shown to be unable to react⁽³²⁵⁾. A more self-consciously irrational form of anti-semitism was noted by Jean Lévy-Besombes in his report of a visit to Germany during the Munich crisis. He noted that Jews were now not only attacked for profiting from Germany's post-war misery, but also simply for not being German⁽³²⁶⁾. Although Vendredi attacked the Nazi regime and pointed to its weaknesses, all the commentators remained convinced of its stability. Prof. Edmond Vermeil, writing in February 1938 acknowledged Hitler's difficulties with the Elbe farmers, the industrialists and the military, but at the

same time emphasised that the regime was not crumbling and that it had a firm political base in the middle class⁽³²⁷⁾. Jean Prévost writing in July 1938 claimed that "le nazisme n'a pas réussi... à améliorer la situation réelle des Allemands". Nonetheless he also stressed that Nazism had popular support because of its foreign policy, as Germans disliked being seen as weak abroad⁽³²⁸⁾.

Philippe Diole took this argument even further in an article of October 1938. His view was that the regime was solid because Hitler was "l'expression de l'âme allemand". Hitler was therefore seen as a protector by the people, who believed he had their interests at heart⁽³²⁹⁾. Like the other commentators, Guéhenno did not question the strength

of the Nazis. His major article on Nazism of April 1937 attempted to understand rather than condemn. Guéhenno suggested that the coming of Hitler was a reaction to the defeat and misery of Germany, and consequently pointed to French responsibilities:

"Il faut guérir ce peuple et l'obliger à reconnaître dans nos yeux la volonté de son bonheur" As for the historical reasons for Hitler's ascent to power, Guéhenno was convinced that German democracy died "de ses (propres) combinaisons et de ses russes"⁽³³⁰⁾.

It is clear that Vendredi aimed at a serious understanding of the nature of the Nazis and that this was reflected in the nature of its criticism, as well as in the general conclusion.

Vendredi preferred to discuss support for the regime rather than its more theatrical gestures⁽³³¹⁾, whilst its most important conclusion, that fascist states were dependent on Western credit⁽³³²⁾, enabled the Democracies to counter the Nazi threat.

P. Gérin, writing in February 1938 drew attention to the potential of the economic "stick" and urged its use, "contre les chiens enragés"⁽³³³⁾. In so doing, Gérin was following Vendredi's

official policy of demanding firmness with respect to Italy and Germany: "La fermeté française peut empêcher une aventure"⁽³³⁴⁾.

Vendredi's interest in other countries was not limited to those which were at war, or whose aggressive behaviour endangered French security. Britain especially attracted the paper's attention and this included home as well as foreign policy. An article by Wickham Steed welcomed the election of Stanley Baldwin, whose belief in collective security and anger over Ethiopia was seen as reassuring⁽³³⁵⁾. James Lloyd wrote about the English libel laws, with reference to Blum's successful prosecution of the Daily Telegraph, which accused him of having interests in a munitions factory⁽³³⁶⁾. Two major articles were devoted to the Abdication Crisis of 1936. Wickham Steed claimed that the abdication was welcomed by the British, who disapproved of Edward VIII's inability to put the crown before an infatuation⁽³³⁷⁾. Steed's arguments were however totally dismissed by George Bernard Shaw, who reacting to Steed's article, claimed that it was the ruling classes and not the masses who were outraged by Edward VIII's behaviour⁽³³⁸⁾. The importance which Vendredi attached to British affairs was demonstrated by the fact that it commissioned its articles from major British journalists. The collaboration of Steed, which the paper gratefully acknowledged in an introduction to his article of the 18th December 1936⁽³³⁹⁾, was a particularly significant asset in this area. Given the dependence of French foreign policy on British leadership, it comes as no surprise that Vendredi devoted considerable space to Britain's ideas in this field. The paper's articles were characterised by a deep resentment

of Chamberlain's behaviour. On the 4th March 1938 the Vendredi editorial attacked his policy of appeasement towards Mussolini as well as his hostility to the idea of collective security. Chamberlain's policy was held to be an expression of "l'ombre périlleuse du pacte à quatre"⁽³⁴⁰⁾. The week following the publication of this editorial Vendredi again attacked Chamberlain. This time it condemned his abandoning of small states as a dangerous method of assuring peace⁽³⁴¹⁾. A fortnight after Munich, an unsigned article appeared which drew attention to the long-term ineffectiveness of Chamberlain's policy of protecting the British and French colonial empires, by diverting Hitler's attention to Central Europe. The question was asked how long could Chamberlain keep surrendering to Hitler's demands?⁽³⁴²⁾.

As a neighbour, Belgium was viewed with concern by Vendredi. In March 1936 A. Harbaru wrote of the seriousness of the threat from the fascist Rex movement of Léon Degrelle, whose political ideas were derived from Hitler's Munich programme⁽³⁴³⁾. In October Paul Nizan gave his account of the abortive attempt by Degrelle to seize power in Brussels. Nizan drew attention to the bad weather on the day of the abortive coup, to the weakness *of the*

Rexists organisation and the the disarray in its ranks following Degrelle's trip to Berlin, as factors which contributed to the failure⁽³⁴⁴⁾. The final electoral defeat of Degrelle in April 1937 was marked by Vendredi with a front-page article by Émile Vandervelde⁽³⁴⁵⁾.

Vendredi's interest in other European countries was generally limited to times of crises, when those countries fell victim to fascist aggression. Such aggression was not necessarily of a direct nature: In May 1936 Francis Jourdain drew attention to German influence in Rumania, where anti-fascists were persecuted whilst pro-fascist students paraded with a Rumanian flag to which a swastika was affixed⁽³⁴⁶⁾. A preoccupation with European crises did not mean Vendredi was indifferent to more distant countries. In July 1937 Jean Perrigault's article on China announced the new alliance of communists and Chiang Kai Shek nationalists in a common front against Japan⁽³⁴⁷⁾. In August Vendredi's editorial gave the paper's view on the war in China: "(c'est) une guerre voulue, provoquée, délibérément engagée par le Japon"⁽³⁴⁸⁾. In November Vendredi criticised the Democracies for tolerating Japan's insolence and succumbing to its pressure, by closing Chinese newspapers in the European concessionary areas⁽³⁴⁹⁾. Finally, in January 1938 Vendredi again drew attention in its editorial to the massive loss of life in China, giving an estimate of 200,000 dead⁽³⁵⁰⁾.

Although Vendredi took an interest in foreign states, especially those on whom France depended for its security, or **by** whom it was threatened, only two countries were presented as potential models for France: These were the United States and the Soviet Union. The most striking aspect of Vendredi's presentation of the United States was the concentration on the ideas and actions of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The first

time the president was mentioned in an editorial of January 1936, it was already apparent that his views had enormous importance for the paper. Roosevelt's speech on the role of the executive in a democracy was compared to a Papal Encyclical, whilst his commitment to neutrality was presented as harmful to the dictatorships. This was because neutrality could be "active" if it involved a refusal to aid the dictators. Nevertheless Roosevelt's personal magnetism was at least as important as the policies he represented. Pierre Brossolette's article of January 1936 drew attention to a long list of failed policies pursued by the president, but concluded by stressing his continuing personal popularity. Roosevelt was above all a star, but one endowed with "le sens social"⁽³⁵²⁾. Hence Emil Ludwig saw Roosevelt as a symbol for our times. Ludwig especially welcomed the fact that the president had managed to change a conservative state into a semi-socialist one, whilst at the same time preserving universal suffrage, Congress and a free opposition: "par la persuasion et l'humour (il) accomplit une révolution sans fracas"⁽³⁵³⁾. Roosevelt's "New Deal" was a further reason for Vendredi's interest in him, because the paper advocated similar economic policies in France. In May 1936 François Crucy gave a detailed account of Roosevelt's tax proposals, the purpose of which was to force Holdings Companies to pay out more of their profits to shareholders and thereby stimulate consumer spending in the country⁽³⁵⁴⁾. The implication of this article was that the Front Populaire government should take similar measures. The same purpose was served by Paul Gérin's article of February

1937, explaining the Supreme Court's sabotage of Roosevelt's economic laws⁽³⁵⁵⁾. The parallels between the Supreme Court, made up of nominees of previous presidents and the French Senate, made up of members elected several years before the 1936 election were obvious, particularly since both bodies sought to thwart a reformist executive. Nonetheless for Vendredi the most important aspect of Roosevelt's policy was his commitment to peace. In September 1936 the paper gave front page space in its editorial, to the president's proposal of a heads of government meeting to discuss peace, and added its own idea of general, controlled disarmament⁽³⁵⁶⁾. This was followed by a very important statement in November 1936, when Vendredi introduced the concept of America as the saviour of world peace. The paper urged Roosevelt to speak on peace, as it believed that the might of the United States could frustrate the dictators' plans⁽³⁵⁷⁾. Vendredi's views were taken up by Blum in a speech made at the American Club dinner, which the paper reported in February 1937. Having declared that France and the United States "procèdent des mêmes principes... vers le même but", he addressed America as an ally: "(la France) est convaincue que l'amitié américaine reste l'une des conditions vitales de la paix"⁽³⁵⁸⁾. The call for a common front of democratic states around the United States was clearly formulated by Edmond Vermeil in the issue of the 30th September 1937⁽³⁵⁹⁾ and repeated the following week in the Vendredi editorial⁽³⁶⁰⁾. The positive, even enthusiastic presentation of America in Vendredi owed much to the influence of Guéhenno, whose personal views were most clearly

defined in "Ce que peuvent des paroles simples et pures". This article, which appeared in October 1937 was a tribute to America, Guéhenno claimed that in 1917 America gave him hope and that the works of President W. Wilson as well as those of Walt Whitman "me remirent, dans les années 1917-1920 sur le vrai chemin de la vie". As for America's contemporary role, Guéhenno believed that Roosevelt was a spokesman for all humanity⁽³⁶¹⁾.

In contrast to the consistently positive presentation of the United States, the presentation of the Soviet Union underwent a major change in the course of the three years Vendredi appeared. The initial attitude was one of admiration and this was reflected in articles of 1936 such as the one by Charles Vildrac, who wrote about a childrens' bookshop he saw in Moscow⁽³⁶²⁾, as well as in a serious review of Louis Fischer's account of his Soviet visit⁽³⁶³⁾. There were good reasons for supporting the Soviets. Simone Téry, the daughter of Vendredi's director Andrée Viollis, saw the Soviet Union as a land of free journalism. Her account of an interview with Pravda editor Michel Koltzov, published in Vendredi in March 1936, made for interesting reading. Koltzov claimed that Pravda's function was to denounce abuses, criticise bad administration and defend innocent victims. Furthermore he assured Simon Téry that in contrast to France, there were no "hommes tabous" in the U.S.S.R., because everyone had to expect to be criticised in the Press. As if to emphasise this point, Simone Téry wrote of her shame, when Koltzov asked her about Press freedoms in France⁽³⁶⁴⁾. The Stalinist constitution was held by Romain Rolland in an article of June 1936, to be "la

plus humaine et la plus libre"⁽³⁶⁵⁾. Such admiration was justified by the wording of the constitution, but missed the essential point, which was that stated by George Bernard Shaw. Shaw dismissed the constitution as window-dressing for the West⁽³⁶⁶⁾.

The change in Vendredi's view of the Soviet Union is best seen in the articles by Guéhenno, which range from the early sycophantic preface to the Soviet edition of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans⁽³⁶⁷⁾ - which was a development of the more muted expression of enthusiasm to be found in Jeunesse de la France, to the highly controversial denunciation of the Moscow trials. Guéhenno's first article on the trials, the front-page "Devoirs de la France" of the 16th October 1936, began with an affirmation that the author's purpose was not to attack the P.C.F. nor the Stalinist achievement. At the same time however, Guéhenno also stated that "tel procès avilit l'homme, les accusés, les juges" Furthermore he cast doubt on the authenticity of the confessions: "il n'est pas une parole des accusés qui soit psychologiquement vraie" Guéhenno concluded by denouncing the degeneration of the Soviet Revolution: "la vraie révolution ne peut pas faire peur"⁽³⁶⁸⁾. The significance of this article is missed by most commentators, who prefer to concentrate on Guéhenno's second, much weaker article on the trials. Only Alain Decaux gives it the credit it deserves: "Son angoisse et sa réprobation, Jean Guéhenno fait plus que les exprimer, il les crie. Qui ne penserait aujourd'hui que, ce jour-là, Jean Guéhenno a sauvé l'honneur de la pensée de gauche?"⁽³⁶⁹⁾. Although Guéhenno's attack on the

Soviet Union was important, it has to be seen in the context of previous criticisms made by Left-wing intellectuals.

According to David Caute, by 1927 most of the original French communist intellectuals had been expelled from the P.C.F.⁽³⁷⁰⁾

and these people were vociferous in their criticism of communism both at home and in the U.S.S.R. With respect to the more immediate question of the trials, their reality was disputed by Trotskyist and oppositionist intellectuals in France⁽³⁷¹⁾.

Victor Serge in particular, formed a Committee of inquiry into the trials, having earlier denounced Stalinism and the Stalinist Constitution⁽³⁷²⁾. Nevertheless Guéhenno's public attack on the Soviets in a paper devoted to a common front with the P.C.F.

was a revelation which was to lead to serious difficulties for Vendredi. With hindsight, Guéhenno's first article takes on the added authority of being one of the few to doubt the authenticity of the trials. Even such well-informed authorities as the American Ambassador and the Observer newspaper failed to attack the trials at this level - the latter in fact took the case against Zinoviev to be genuine⁽³⁷³⁾.

In his second article on the trials of the 5th February 1937, Guéhenno weakened his earlier argument by contradicting himself. Beginning with the statement: "j'ai lu je pense tout ce qu'on peut lire en France au sujet de ces procès", Guéhenno appeared to retract his earlier views: "il semble impossible de mettre en doute la culpabilité des accusés". Nonetheless he concludes by saying "ils avouent trop! On ne peut le croire!"⁽³⁷⁴⁾. By concentrating on the second article, David Caute is able to claim that Guéhenno's

argument was weak and limited itself to a call for an end to the bloodshed⁽³⁷⁵⁾. Herbert R. Lottman takes a similar view, claiming that only Gide doubted the authenticity of the trials⁽³⁷⁶⁾. What both critics fail to appreciate is that Guéhenno stated his views clearly in October 1936, and that his later weakness was a result of pressure from communists⁽³⁷⁷⁾ and concern for the unity of the Front Populaire, as well as for the survival of Vendredi. In La Foi difficile Guéhenno gives the Soviet question as the main reason (with Spain) for the break-up of the Front Populaire and the collapse of Vendredi⁽³⁷⁸⁾. He also recalls how the communists put economic pressure on the paper, by buying or boycotting it, depending on the contents of the preceding week's issue⁽³⁷⁹⁾. Given this communist hostility towards Guéhenno in the wake of the Moscow Trials articles, it was not surprising that he broke all relations with the communists as a result⁽³⁸⁰⁾. This was very evident in the complete change of direction of Vendredi on Soviet matters. The editorial of the 17th December 1937 dismissed the Soviet elections as mere formality and a "hommage aux démocraties"⁽³⁸¹⁾. The following week's editorial expressed disquiet over the latest executions in the U.S.S.R.⁽³⁸²⁾, whilst the editorial of the 4th March 1938 drew attention to the protests of the Internationale syndicale et socialiste and the Ligue des Droits de l'homme over the trial which began on March 3rd. Vendredi noted the outrage of the former organisation at the announcement of the trial verdict in the official Soviet press, in advance of the trial itself⁽³⁸³⁾. An earlier article by Louis Martin-Chauffier drew

attention to the "renaissance du culte de Pierre le Grand"⁽³⁸⁴⁾. Since Martin-Chauffier also noted that Peter the Great was presented as a constructor, the implications of this article were that Stalin was modelling himself on a tyrant.

Although a general change in editorial policy on the U.S.S.R. after Guéhenno's articles on the Moscow trials, can be demonstrated by reference to Vendredi's articles on Soviet affairs, the most important evidence of this change was the publication in Vendredi of the "Avant-propos" to André Gide's Retour de l'U.R.S.S., on the 6th November 1936. This is because the contents of the book were to result in a major scandal and political embarrassment for both the U.S.S.R. and the P.C.F. As the most famous convert to communism, Gide was first invited to Moscow in 1933, but he delayed his trip until June 1936. When he finally arrived in Russia, he discovered that persecution of homosexuals was not the Soviet's only fault and decided to publish a critique of what he saw⁽³⁸⁵⁾. David Caute however, claims that Gide's Retour de l'U.R.S.S. is a broadly based view of Soviet Russia rather than a personal account. Gide's statements on Soviet art policy and the view of Soviet democracy as a farce, are given as examples⁽³⁸⁶⁾. Having completed his book in September 1936, Gide consulted his companion on the trip Louis Guilloux, as well as Nizan, Malraux and Chamson, for their opinions on the manuscript⁽³⁸⁷⁾. Chamson, himself a recent visitor to Russia, decided to use Gide's work to present his own negative opinion of that country. Madeleine Berry claims that Ilya Ehrenbourg first shattered Chamson's illusions about the Soviets "en lui révélant l'existence des camps".

Moreover Boris Pasternak informed him that Soviet writers "manquaient absolument de liberté"⁽³⁸⁸⁾. Chamson himself states that the only reason he did not himself condemn the Soviets, was concern for his friends: "je ne voulais pas mettre en danger des amis... et en particulier Ehrenbourg"⁽³⁸⁹⁾. He was therefore very happy to publish the "Avant-propos" in Vendredi. particularly since "ce que disait Gide de l'U.R.S.S. était bénin, ce n'était pas terrible"⁽³⁹⁰⁾. Chamson's opinion was not shared by the Left-wing press, nor indeed by Left-wing intellectuals like Romain Rolland, who were shocked and angered by Gide's book⁽³⁹¹⁾. Chamson himself later accepts that life became difficult for Vendredi the day Gide "était allé... visiter l'U.R.S.S."⁽³⁹²⁾. The first reply to Gide's critique to appear in Vendredi was an open letter from a communist friend of Gide's, Pierre Herbart. Herbart had been in the U.S.S.R. with Gide and had experienced considerable anxiety, when carrying a manuscript of the Retour de l'U.R.S.S., in Soviet-controlled Spain⁽³⁹³⁾. Herbart's article of the 20th November did not dispute Gide's observations and confirmed that "pour le moment (en l'U.R.S.S.) il ne s'agit pas du socialisme". Nevertheless Herbart claimed that until other countries joined the world revolution, the U.S.S.R. could only survive as a strong state. A communist had therefore not only to accept the present imperfect reality, "mais (la) servir totalement". Herbart's quarrel with Gide was not over the Soviet Union's imperfections, but the reasons for them⁽³⁹⁴⁾. In the two months of official silence in Vendredi, following the publication of Herbart's article, the battle over Gide's

Retour de l'U.R.S.S. was fought in the paper's editorial offices⁽³⁹⁵⁾. In a bid to placate the communists, whose support was essential to Vendredi's continued existence, all three directors went to see Gide and persuaded him to publish an appeal in favour of Republican Spain, the "Il va de soi" of the 22nd January 1937⁽³⁹⁶⁾. In this article Gide denounced the Right's abuse of Retour de l'U.R.S.S. and gave full support to the Republican cause in Spain⁽³⁹⁷⁾. Pierre Herbart, after being forced to accept changes in his article at the request of Vendredi's directors⁽³⁹⁸⁾, returned to his earlier arguments in "Sur Retour de l'U.R.S.S. d'André Gide", of the 29th January 1937. This time he devoted a whole page to explaining that Gide's facts were correct, but that they could be excused by the backwardness of the U.S.S.R.⁽³⁹⁹⁾.

The bitterness of the communist attacks on Gide increased markedly when Retouches à mon Retour de l'U.R.S.S. appeared in July 1937. Aragon was so angered by this second more violent attack on the Soviets, that he asked Louis Guilloux to write a reply to Gide's new arguments. Louis Guilloux refused, but when he again declined to attack Gide on the invitation of Jean-Richard Bloch, the latter decided to gently remove him from his job on Ce Soir - a job which was initially offered to Louis Guilloux by Aragon in January 1937⁽⁴⁰⁰⁾. For Vendredi the immediate consequences of publishing the "Avant-propos" were a battle between socialists and communists for control of the paper⁽⁴⁰¹⁾, which led to a fall in sales from 300,000

to 200,000⁽⁴⁰²⁾, although Madeleine Berry's figures are disputed by others. Whereas in its early stages, the battle over Retour de l'U.R.S.S. was waged between the communists and Gide, with Vendredi as an arbitrator, the paper's attitude to Gide changed dramatically when he asked the directors to publish his revelations on communist persecution of the anarchists in Spain⁽⁴⁰³⁾. The background to this request was a petition which Gide signed in favour of prisoners in republican jails. Ilya Ehrenbourg attacked Gide for signing such a petition, which in turn provoked Gide into writing the article which Vendredi refused to publish⁽⁴⁰⁴⁾. This refusal to allow him a reply to Ehrenbourg's personal insult was interpreted by Gide as a snub. Consequently, not content with the publication of the disputed article in La Flèche of the 20th November 1937, he launched a full-scale attack on Vendredi in the issue of La Flèche of the 11th December 1937. His main charge was that Vendredi was a partisan paper which did not permit free discussion⁽⁴⁰⁵⁾. This accusation provoked a violent public outburst from Guéhenno in the issue of Vendredi of the 17th December. In his open letter to Gide, Guéhenno stated that "Vendredi était totalement libre" Furthermore he claimed that he did not need Gide's example to criticise the U.S.S.R. and added: "Je n'attribuais jamais... à votre pensée politique aucune importance". Finally Guéhenno gave Gide a lesson in the meaning of fidelity and friendship: "Chacun de nous (à Vendredi) ne se préfère pas à tout"⁽⁴⁰⁶⁾. Gide's reaction to this attack was to write a letter refuting Guéhenno's views, which Vendredi published on the 24th December 1937. In his

letter Gide reaffirmed his devotion to the paper and all that it represented, but at the same time he condemned the personal nature of Guéhenno's attack on him: "Guéhenno parle beaucoup trop de sa personne et de la mienne", says Gide, but he fails to attend to the issues⁽⁴⁰⁷⁾. Despite agreeing to publish Gide's letter, Guéhenno insisted on accompanying the letter with further comments from himself. In his response to Gide, Guéhenno denied wanting to acquire fame by association and mostly restated Vendredi's original reasons for refusing Gide's article on Spain. He did however add a new argument, claiming that Gide's views on the disputes within the Spanish Left were not shared by Vendredi⁽⁴⁰⁸⁾. Guéhenno's final comments on his dispute with Gide came in an article of the 7th January 1938. Here, he regretted that "la France est infectée d'esprit totalitaire". At the same time however, he defended the Front Populaire revolution "tout incomplète qu'elle soit"⁽⁴⁰⁹⁾. Clearly Guéhenno did not regret putting the defence of this revolution, before the views of Gide. One aspect of the quarrel with Gide which needs emphasising is the personal animosity Guéhenno felt towards Gide and which is very evident in Guéhenno's open letters to him. Eugène Dabit noted Guéhenno's dislike of Gide as early as 1933⁽⁴¹⁰⁾, whilst Gide himself noted Guéhenno's attacks on him for "cultivating the differences" between men, in his journal of 1935⁽⁴¹¹⁾. Nonetheless the significance of the quarrel lies in its consequences, rather than in the arguments raised by the two writers.

Given the interest expressed by Vendredi in foreign affairs, it is surprising to find that the paper took only a minimal interest in colonial matters. Although it published an article by Malraux questioning the principle of colonialism in its first issue⁽⁴¹²⁾, Vendredi did not support independence for French colonies. Andrée Viollis' article of the 28th November 1935 specifically rejected independence and affirmed the superiority of French culture, although it condemned colonial injustices⁽⁴¹³⁾. Her article on Indochina of the 13th June 1936 which dealt with the problems raised in her book Indochine SOS, of the previous year⁽⁴¹⁴⁾, called only for economic reforms that would help the peasants, and for the introduction of primary education as well as better health care⁽⁴¹⁵⁾. Andrée Viollis' basic attitude of condemning injustice and calling for reform in the colonies was shared by Guéhenno, in his articles on North Africa, which he visited in the summers of 1936, 1937 and 1938⁽⁴¹⁶⁾. In his article of the 18th June 1937 Guéhenno wrote about the famine in Algeria and the injustices practised by the settlers, who believed they had a right to a privileged position⁽⁴¹⁷⁾. In his account of the 12th August 1938, of his 2,000 km tour of Tunisia, Guéhenno referred to his "mauvaise conscience" as a Frenchman in Tunisia. He noted how the excesses of capitalism developed most fully in the colonies, but at the same time he praised the achievements of the colonisers, admiring the irrigation schemes and the education system. Guéhenno was fully conscious of his pro-colonial viewpoint and anticipated criticism of his position: "des amis regretteront que je paraisse célébrer la "colonisation""⁽⁴¹⁸⁾.

His article on Tunisa was also a reflection of Vendredi's editorial policy on the colonies. On the 5th November 1937 Vendredi's editorial explained unrest in Morocco in terms of colonial exploitation by the banks, which is why it regarded reforms as essential⁽⁴¹⁹⁾. A fortnight later Jean Perrigault welcomed the first reforms for Morocco, emphasising the role played by Vendredi in securing these reforms⁽⁴²⁾.

The general impression of Front Populaire foreign policy, as presented by Vendredi is inevitably a negative one, and this reflected the views of both the directors and the contributors of the paper. The policy of not criticising the government and the alliance parties did not apply to the area of foreign policy. The Vendredi editorial of the 30th October 1936 was an early but damning critique of Front Populaire failure in this field. The major criticisms, were the failure to rectify the disastrous Laval policy, the lack of French diplomatic initiatives on peace and the effectively anti-republican doctrine of neutrality over Spain⁽⁴²¹⁾. Nevertheless Vendredi's hostility to the use of force, diminished the strength of its criticisms of the government, because no credible alternative policy for dealing with fascism was put forward.

On the wider question of Vendredi's presentation of the Front Populaire experience, it is clear that the paper refused to be purely partisan or politically expedient. This is most obviously true of Jean Guéhenno, whose day-to-day involvement in political issues did not lead to any sacrifice of his ideals. On the contrary, he was prepared to write about the Soviet

show-trials out of a sense of moral outrage, despite knowing the political consequences of his actions. Guéhenno's constant concern with moral as well as political issues was reflected in several of his articles, which demonstrated the same convictions as his major texts. In April 1936 Guéhenno reaffirmed his long-held belief, that "l'avenir de la France (est) dans sa raison". He claimed that the Republic was still a great ideal and emphasised the importance of spiritual values, saying: "nous voulons avec du pain la liberté". Consequently Guéhenno denied that he was a politician, preferring to stress the fact that he spoke with "désintéressement"⁽⁴²²⁾. Guéhenno's article for the 1st May 1936 also drew attention to the spiritual rather than political goals of socialism. May Day was therefore presented as a symbol of the hope that "la notion d'honneur serait attachée à tout travail"⁽⁴²³⁾. In his article for the 10th May 1936 Guéhenno gave his views on freedom, which he hailed as "génie des hommes de mon pays". Referring to Voltaire, he defined freedom as the conviction that "l'industrie humaine était le seul moyen de faire des paradis". Finally he reminded his readers of the moral purpose of all revolutions: "les seules révolutions que la France veut accomplir doivent rendre les hommes plus libres"⁽⁴²⁴⁾. Guéhenno's constant reference to French revolutionary values in his articles for Vendredi was a significant development and it was one which is more fully expressed in Jeunesse de la France. On the question of peace, Guéhenno linked the moral and the practical, political problems. In his article of the 1st April 1938 he said:

"Notre patrie ne fut et ne sera jamais qu'une certaine idée de justice... et nous voulons la justice parce que nous voulons la paix". This is why he defended his decision to sign a pro-peace declaration of Left and Right-wing writers, against the charge of it being another "Union Sacrée"⁽⁴²⁵⁾. Writing in the paper of the Front Populaire in 1936, Guéhenno restated his pre-1914 belief in Jaurèsian socialism. In his article of the 31st July 1936 he praised Jaurès because "il ne croyait qu'en la raison". Moreover he aligns himself with Jaurès when he says that for Jaurès the political question is a moral question⁽⁴²⁶⁾. It is therefore possible to conclude that there is no contradiction between Guéhenno's views expressed in his major texts and in his work on Vendredi. This is because in both cases he remains true to his ideals and presents them as having greater importance than practical political actions.

Because Vendredi presented itself as the paper of writers as well as journalists, it comes as no surprise to find a substantial part of the paper devoted to literary matters. Vendredi's approach was to serialise substantial, mainly fictional work, publish fragments of books by major authors and devote a regular page to literary criticism. At the same time however, this conventional presentation of literary matters was supplemented by an extended debate on the significance of a writer's political "engagement" and on the role of literature, both of which were particularly important to Guéhenno.

The sheer amount of space devoted to writers' political "engagement", suggests that for Vendredi this was more significant than the works of individual writers, or even literary movements. It is worth noting the amount of space devoted to the XIV International PEN-Club Conference and to Jules Romain's appeal to world governments in favour of peace⁽⁴²⁷⁾. Even more important was the publicity afforded to the declarations of the Association Internationale des écrivains pour la défense de la culture and the Comité de vigilance des intellectuels anti-fascistes. In the wake of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland it is to the C.V.I.A.-F. rather than to politicians, that Vendredi turned for a coherent political response to the crisis⁽⁴²⁸⁾. Writers were not only presented as experts in foreign policy, but were also seen as having an obligation to speak out on such issues. The resolution of the Madrid conference of the A.I.E.D.C., held in July 1937, ignored artistic questions, calling instead on all writers to redouble their efforts "dans la lutte qu'ils ont entreprise (en faveur de l'Espagne) pour faire éclater la vérité"⁽⁴²⁹⁾. The question of a writer's political "engagement" was taken to extremes in such articles as Andrée Viollis' tribute to Romain Rolland. This article avoided any mention of Romain Rolland's artistic achievements, but was instead full of praise for his appeals for peace and his speeches on Spain. The latter were seen as oracles, listened to "par la conscience universelle"⁽⁴³⁰⁾. The logical culmination of the more extreme views on "engagement" was the case of Gustav Regler, who abandoned writing, went to fight in Spain and insisted that he was only a soldier. Little wonder then, that an article on this "écrivain

soldat" should have appeared in Vendredi⁽⁴³¹⁾. In the final analysis however, the paper rejected "engagement". Despite the early enthusiasm for this understanding of a writer's obligations, by October 1938 the experience of the Front Populaire convinced the directors (Guéhenno especially), that "engagement" was futile. Consequently they saw fit to publish an article on Emil Ludwig's critique of "engagement" on the front page. Ludwig despaired of the ability of writers to make an impact politically and gave the total ineffectiveness of Jules Romain's manifesto as an example: "Alors à quoi bon perdre son temps dans la politique, et son talent, si l'on en a?"⁽⁴³²⁾.

Regardless of whether it was or was not effective, "engagement" as a phenomenon was only possible, because in the 1930s writers commanded considerable respect⁽⁴³³⁾. Hence the importance attached to their political views. This being the case, writers felt encouraged to speak out on political issues and this led to the situation described by Jean Sarracini: "le littérateur moderne ... s'improvise expert sur tous sujets"⁽⁴³⁴⁾. A politically committed writer was clearly much more than a literary figure. Writing about the visit to Paris of the Soviet poets Bezymensky, Kissanov, Lougouskoi and Selvinsky, Eugène Dabit noted that they were more interested in life than in art, and Bezymensky in particular sought to become the "haut parleur" of socialist ideas⁽⁴³⁵⁾. By becoming "engagé" a writer aspired to the role of a political and spiritual leader. In an article entitled "Le héros de l'Europe", Guéhenno praised Romain Rolland -

the father of inter-war "engagement", for having shown the world that a writer could be a hero⁽⁴³⁶⁾. Romain Rolland himself, writing in Vendredi on the occasion of Gorki's death, presented the deceased as a man who enjoyed political influence because of his political commitment: by using his prestige as a writer to aid the Revolution, Gorki became the friend of the Soviet leadership, who in turn benefited from his advice⁽⁴³⁷⁾. This conception of a writer's role is nevertheless open to criticism. Julien Benda's article for Vendredi expressed the regret that nearly all "gens de lettres" now had pretensions as political thinkers and that ordinary people as well as governments accepted them as such⁽⁴³⁸⁾. Henri Polles also presented writers as pretentious and spoilt. He drew particular attention to their dislike of the very concept "hommes de lettres", because it expressed too narrow a view of their role⁽⁴³⁹⁾. The vanity of the politically committed writer was strongly criticised by Robert Brasillach in his analysis of Guéhenno's work, but this was a criticism of equal relevance to Guéhenno's colleagues: "la vanité de l'homme de lettres n'a... jamais été poussée aussi loin que dans l'équipe de... Vendredi"⁽⁴⁴⁰⁾.

The view that the writer should be a politically committed figure, raises the issue of what kind of literature is to be produced and also its function in society. The question was addressed by Paul Nizan in "Une littérature responsable", published in the first issue of Vendredi. Nizan divided literature into two types: "littérature de résistance" and "littérature de mouvement". Because he saw literature as the

mirror of a civilisation, he rejected the former, classicist literature, because the fixed forms of classicism reflected a fixed, stable society which no longer existed. Nizan therefore wanted a dynamic literature, critical of society and focussing on issues rather than characters. Among the early exponents of this new literature, Nizan named Faulkner, Kafka and Dostoievski. Nevertheless these writers' very negative attitude to the existing society, made them unsuitable as models for the future. As a result Nizan looked to the positive and political work of Malraux, especially Le Temps du Mépris, for an example of his literary ideal⁽⁴⁴¹⁾. Evidently it was Nizan's hope that if French writers followed Malraux's example, the decline in French culture which he considered to be a fact, could be halted⁽⁴⁴²⁾. Nizan's views clearly challenged the already mentioned assertions of Julien Benda, who in La Trahison des clercs regretted the collapse of classical culture⁽⁴⁴³⁾, because he believed that modern Man was no different to the ancients⁽⁴⁴⁴⁾. Furthermore, Nizan's advocacy of a political literature was totally unacceptable to Benda, for whom according to Robert J. Niess, "the conception of a philosopher (or scientist or writer) in society (was) simply untenable"⁽⁴⁴⁵⁾. Throughout the entire discussion of the role of literature in Vendredi, the importance of the social question was repeatedly emphasised. As a result Vendredi published an article by John Lehmann, noting approvingly the change in English poetry. Lehmann claims that only a decade earlier, British poets had refused to believe a connection existed between works of the literary imagination and political movements. Since that time events such as the fall of the Labour government and the

Soviet Five year plan, had convinced British writers of the need to be interested in politics. W.H. Auden, Stephen Spender and C. Day Lewis represented this new attitude, because all were convinced that society was "mal faite"⁽⁴⁴⁶⁾. In France, Romain Rolland's play Le 14 juillet earned the praise of François Lassagne, who drew parallels between 1789 and 1936. What Lassagne found particularly encouraging about this play was that its 1936 production by Gémier encouraged the audience to participate in the performance. The singing of the "International" by actors and audience at the end of the play, demonstrated the play's popular relevance and appeal⁽⁴⁴⁷⁾. Guéhenno gave the work of his friend Eugène Dabit as an example of the committed literature he wished to see created. Dabit was seen as a precursor of future artists, who would be contented with leading simple lives. Guéhenno admired him because he remained firmly rooted in the masses: "c'était un artiste qui continuait de vivre comme un ouvrier"⁽⁴⁴⁸⁾. One of the effects of encouraging a literature where social concerns are dominant is that the distinction between literature and journalism becomes indistinct. This was the view of Lucien Descaves, the drama critic of l'Intransigeant, who, writing in Vendredi in May 1936, made it clear that for him journalism was not a "second best" literary career⁽⁴⁴⁹⁾. This acceptance of journalism as a legitimate form of literary expression is perhaps most strikingly demonstrated by the career of Louis-Ferdinand Céline, who according to Patrick McCarthy "needed to be a pamphleteer"⁽⁴⁵⁰⁾. As a result: "for the rest of his life and after his death he would be as much the author of Bagatelles pour un Massacre, as of Voyage au bout de la Nuit"⁽⁴⁵¹⁾.

Although they supported the ideal of "engagement" Vendredi's collaborators did not subscribe to the more extreme Marxist view, that literature was simply a reflection of the economy. Indeed, René Lalou claimed that the belief that economic factors alone determined art, was spread by enemies of Marxism. Referring to Jean Fréville's book on Marx, Lalou stated that despite being an ideological superstructure based on the economy, art was also influenced by non-economic factors and that it was moreover one of the factors which could change society⁽⁴⁵²⁾. Pierre Bost also took this view and warned against the excesses of "engagement": "la politique, les guerres, les questions d'argent sont extrêmement importantes, elles ne sont pourtant pas les seules"⁽⁴⁵³⁾. Such a statement reflected the essential viewpoint of Vendredi, which was that the concern with the social question was not an end in itself, but a solution to the visible crisis in literature and culture. With reference to literature, Marcelle Loutrel claimed that the present crisis was due to an improper publishing policy, which priced books without regard to differences in quality and to the fact that "peu de valeur (est) attribué aujourd'hui aux choses de l'esprit"⁽⁴⁵⁴⁾. This latter point was taken up by Pierre Bost, who stated that "les gens n'ont plus envie de lire... ils préfèrent le bon dîner"⁽⁴⁵⁵⁾. Georges Lubin however, drew attention to the quality rather than the quantity of what was being read. He regretted the success of romantic novels of little value and added: "ce n'est pas le goût, c'est le bon goût de la lecture, qu'il convient de soigner"⁽⁴⁵⁶⁾.

Guéhenno, for whom culture was Man's greatest attribute, noted the contemporary "paresse de l'esprit". Returning to one of the themes of Caliban parle, he accused the cultural elite of making culture their exclusive privilege and thereby alienating the majority of ordinary, literate people⁽⁴⁵⁷⁾.

Furthermore in an article on the role of radio, Guéhenno discussed the fears of writers and philosophers, of mass media, because they allegedly made culture a commodity to be obtained by a flick of a switch. Although he too was concerned with this problem, he welcomed the radio, since its mass appeal enabled it to "rendre la raison populaire". What was needed therefore, was a responsible use of radio, as "l'esprit libre, peut seul avoir... le soin de former des esprits libres"⁽⁴⁵⁸⁾.

Edmond Schlesinger, in his report from the 1937 schoolteachers' congress, quoted the view of Belgian delegates Pierrard and Dolléans, because they offered a bright future for literature. Dolléans claimed that the working masses were the reading public of the future, whilst Pierrard believed that the shorter working week raised the question of filling the workers' leisure time⁽⁴⁵⁹⁾. Further optimism on the question of literature was provided by Henri Pollès. His article drew attention to the many literary debuts of recent years. In fiction and drama Pierre Bachot and Jean Anouilh were mentioned, while in literary criticism Robert Brasillach, Armand Petitjean, Thierry Maulnier and Henri Lefebvre were given as examples, although these were surprising choices for a Left-wing paper⁽⁴⁶⁰⁾. It is worth noting however that these same critics wrote the

vast majority of the critical articles on Guéhenno's inter-war works, despite being politically Right-wing.

Vendredi's concern for literature extended to the other arts and posed the problem of culture in general. Luc Durtain's contribution to the paper was an article where he raised the question of the mortality of culture, in relation to Paul Valéry's views on the subject. Luc Durtain believed that the essential aspects of Western culture "(étaient) au fond de leur nature éternelles" Nevertheless he also added that "(elles étaient) éternelles aussi longtemps que nous le voulons!", hence "la culture spirituelle de l'homme... exige des soins vigilants"⁽⁴⁶¹⁾. This latter concern was shared by E. and G. Lefranc, who claimed that democracy was impossible unless, "en chaque travailleur (nous cherchons) l'homme, pour l'éveiller et pour l'entraîⁿer". They believed that the workers "(avaient) besoin d'autre chose que le travail" and wanted individual as well as collective liberation. Vulgar Marxism was to be rejected, because by convincing the workers that their liberation would come when capitalist exploitation reached its extreme point, it created more problems in the area of culture, than it solved⁽⁴⁶²⁾. Marxist views on culture were not however condemned outright. Antonio Gramsci was presented by Romain Rolland as a communist and as a man who believed in the necessity of culture. According to Romain Rolland, Gramsci took the view that a communist could not be illiterate, and to this end he founded the paper l'Ordine Nuovo in 1919, where his articles echoed the style of Péguy. The concern for

culture also had practical political effects for Gramsci, who used his paper to urge an alliance of workers and intellectuals⁽⁴⁶³⁾. In his discussion of education in his Prison Notebooks, Gramsci wrote of his hopes to create intellectuals from the working class and of his admiration for the humanistic school, "designed to develop in each individual... an as yet undifferentiated general culture, the fundamental power to think, and the ability to find one's way in life"⁽⁴⁶⁴⁾. Vendredi's concern with culture was so serious, that it not only discussed the subject, but took measures to make culture accessible to its own working-class readers. For this reason articles reviewing entertainments were placed alongside analyses of more serious literary productions. José Bruyr for example, wrote about contemporary jazz, describing the vogue for "hot" jazz⁽⁴⁶⁵⁾, whilst cinema critic Pierre Bost gave a perhaps over-sophisticated criticism of Disney's Snow White. Describing the film as a "chef-d'oeuvre" he also attacked it for its bad taste, because he saw the transformation of the jealous queen into a witch, as demonstrating the most vulgar aesthetic⁽⁴⁶⁶⁾. These reviews of popular entertainments were short and were not given the space allotted to book reviews. Nevertheless this attempt to apply high critical standards to popular culture showed a concern for this culture, as well as a desire to make working people think about it.

An important aspect of Vendredi's presentation of the problem of culture was its concentration on the Nazi abuses

in this area. Fritz Hoff described the situation of German literature under Nazism: "on a interdit en Allemagne une fois de plus la parole de la vérité, de la liberté, de l'humanisme" Consequently he drew attention to the phenomenon of the emigré writer: "une fois de plus la France est devenue la patrie de la littérature allemande" The article was accompanied by a photograph of Nazi censorship at its most extreme - the book-burning in Berlin, of the 10th May 1933⁽⁴⁶⁷⁾. Book-burning was also referred to in an unsigned article on Goebbels' attitude to writing. The author made an ironic comment about Goebbels "purifying" books by fire, but also considered the policy statements made at the editors' congress of June 1938, held in Leipzig and Berlin. Of particular significance was Goebbels' statement that editors were morally and politically responsible to their nation⁽⁴⁶⁸⁾. This had obvious implications for the freedom of the writer and explains Emil Ludwig's speech at the PEN Club congress, attacking Nazi treatment of writers⁽⁴⁶⁹⁾. With the hindsight of forty years Berthold Hinz gives a comprehensive account of Nazi art policy. He denies that a specifically Nazi art ever existed, although he accepts some forms of art had particular favour. At the same time he notes the importance of art to the Nazis, who saw it as more necessary than bread, and justified their buildings in cultural rather than practical terms⁽⁴⁷⁰⁾. Of special relevance to Guéhenno and Vendredi is Hinz's view that the Nazis wanted a healthy, generally accessible culture⁽⁴⁷¹⁾. Quite clearly there were ironic

parallels between the Nazis and Vendredi, in the view of culture. Both wanted art that was "engagé" and although they differed in their political ideals, they were in agreement as to the function of art in society. The call for a culture that was relevant to everyone and the resulting hostility to "pure" art, was a common denominator. Vendredi's condemnation of Nazi cultural policy as intolerant was therefore somewhat hypocritical, but the very fact that the paper chose to condemn the Nazis for their conduct in this area, demonstrated the importance it attached to culture. Further evidence for the latter statement was provided by the decision of the directors to continue with Vendredi as a cultural paper, once its political role became untenable. Reflète, the short-lived successor to Vendredi, concentrated almost exclusively on cultural matters.

The final area of interest of Vendredi, and one which requires only a brief comment, is science. The publication of the handful of scientific articles in the paper invites attention chiefly because they seem so misplaced. Nevertheless in the case of the most significant article by Irène and Frédéric Joliot-Curie on the subject of radioactivity, there were good reasons for its appearance in Vendredi. The article which appeared on the 21st November 1936, was the first to be published by the scientists after their receipt of the Nobel prize. This was a purely political gesture by the Joliot-Curies and one which Vendredi took advantage of. Frédéric Joliot-Curie stated in his introduction that he wished to write in Vendredi because it defended "une cause (politique) qui nous est chère"⁽⁴⁷²⁾.

After a month-long existence under the title Reflets, the Vendredi venture finally closed on the 15th December 1938. The blame for this early collapse is placed by Herbert R. Lottman on three main factors: directional inexperience, the lack of a market for the paper and the dissolution of the Front Populaire⁽⁴⁷³⁾. It is certainly true that without the Front Populaire, Vendredi was left without a political purpose and was deprived of material support from the parties that made up the alliance. Chamson claims that Vendredi's problems became insurmountable as early as 1937, which means they coincided with the first internal disputes and the fall of Blum's first government. Chamson also recalls the difficulties associated with closing the paper in 1938 and the help then given to him by Guéhenno: "l'amitié et l'honnêteté de Jean Guéhenno m'aident dans ce difficile passage"⁽⁴⁷⁴⁾. Both feared a repetition of the fate of Le Quotidien: "ce journal qui fondé avec de l'argent de gens de gauche, était passé à droite"⁽⁴⁷⁵⁾. Closure was therefore the only honourable solution to the three year experiment in journalism of the United Left, which throughout its course reflected the parallel experiment in the political sphere, conducted by the Front Populaire parties.

What clearly emerges from the study of Vendredi's articles over the three-year period is that the paper's major aims were to serve the Front Populaire, to defend world peace without sacrificing international law and to encourage a socially committed literature. With respect to the Front Populaire, Vendredi supported the alliance as an alliance, which is why it published a wide spectrum of political opinion, whilst at

the same time avoiding partisan arguments. Just as important however was the directors' view of the Front Populaire as a spiritual ideal, rather than a politically expedient alliance. The dominance of ideals over practical politics also characterised Vendredi's foreign policy statements. The demand for peace with justice was made in relation to Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia and most significantly Spain. The paper's pronouncements on the Civil War in that country reflected the anguish of the pacifist Left in France, because they demanded French non-intervention as well as a Republican victory, which in practical terms was impossible. Although the presentation of foreign affairs was dominated by the crises involving France, Vendredi took a broad internationalist interest in world affairs, which was free of nationalist prejudice. Indeed Denmark and the United States especially, were presented with admiration as models for France to imitate. The omission of the U.S.S.R. from this category must be emphasised, because it shows Vendredi supported liberal socialism and maintained its independence of the communists. The problem with Vendredi's presentation of literature was that it suffered from a conflict of interests between the writers, whose paper Vendredi was, and the poorly-educated masses which the paper wanted as its readers. This is why the literary works published were heterogeneous in nature, ranging from the "roman policier" to the serious discussions of literary and philosophical issues. Nevertheless a conscious effort was made by many of the contributors to bridge the gap between the cultural elite and the masses, by striving for a socially

concerned literature. In the final analysis however, Vendredi rejected the more extreme forms of political "engagement", because experience showed the ineffectiveness of the writer as a political influence.

Throughout his three-year long association with Vendredi Guéhenno made full use of his powers as a director to influence the paper's editorial policy. He was particularly successful in putting forward his view of the Front Populaire as a spiritual ideal and in this respect his opinions prevailed over Chamson's more pragmatic approach to the alliance. Furthermore, Vendredi's commitment to this understanding of the Front Populaire was not without its consequences, because it led to contempt for political disputes within the alliance and a general hostility to individual political parties. When the Front Populaire collapsed in 1938, responsibility for this was placed squarely on the selfishness of the parties - a view which Guéhenno successfully imposed on the Vendredi editorials. Guéhenno's idealistic approach to political problems clearly demonstrated, that he more than any other director, refused to compromise his moral principles for the sake of political expediency. The strength of his commitment was evident in his decision to personally and publically condemn the Moscow Trials, even though this plunged Vendredi into crisis. It is also worth noting that the marked change in the paper's policy towards the U.S.S.R. after October 1936, was instigated by Guéhenno's articles. The condemnation of civil rights abuses in that country and the publication of the "Avant-propos" to Gide's Retour de l'U.R.S.S. all post-date his "Devoirs de la France".

When Vendredi folded in the autumn of 1938 the period of Guéhenno's "engagement" also came to an end. Having experienced the impotence of intellectual "engagement" in the face of the collapse of the Front Populaire and the gradual worsening of international tension, Guéhenno despaired of it as an intellectual attitude. Furthermore, having seen how communists abused their economic influence over Vendredi to exert political pressure on the paper, Guéhenno made a final break with fellow travelling. With the close of Vendredi he was faced with the need to come to terms with the loss of faith in "engagement" and this is why he chronicled the experience of his disillusion in Journal d'une "Révolution".

Footnotes to Chapter Six

1. A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1.
2. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.81.
3. Guéhenno, in F.D. p.198, notes that "c'était son idée".
4. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1. This is confirmed by Chamson in his Il faut vivre vieux, p.81.
5. See for example: André Chamson, Devenir ce qu'on est. Paris, Ed. Wesmael-Charlier, coll: Les auteurs juges de leurs oeuvres, 1959. p.61.
6. See: André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.81.
7. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1.
8. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.133.
9. See: ibid., p.134, This is confirmed by André Chamson in his Il faut vivre vieux, p.81.
10. See: F.D. p.200.
11. See: ibid., p.200. This is confirmed by Herbert R. Lottman in his La Rive gauche, p.134.
12. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.81.
13. See: ibid., pp. 81-83.
14. See: F.D. p.200.
15. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire. Paris, Éditions Fischbacher, 1977. p.94.

16. See: André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, pp.87-88.
17. This is the view of Herbert R. Lottman, expressed in his La Rive gauche, pp. 135-136.
18. See: André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.88.
19. See: Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.95.
20. See: *ibid.*, p.95.
21. See: F.D. p.200.
22. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.95.
23. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1.
24. See: F.D. p.199. This is confirmed by Madeleine Berry in her André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.94, where she notes: "Vendredi - pour rappeler le nom du bon sauvage de Robinson Crusoe".
25. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.94. What Chamson objected to in the case of Marianne, was that the paper was a commercial operation run by Gallimard.
26. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.133.
27. A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1. This is confirmed by André Chamson in his Il faut vivre vieux, p.89, where he notes that "nous nous réclamions sans cesse de la vérité et de la raison".
28. See for example: F.D. p.205.
29. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.83.

30. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1, where they state that their cause was freedom.
31. See: F.D. p.199.
32. See: *ibid.*, p.206.
33. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.94.
34. Vendredi was first published on the 8th November 1935.
René Albrecht Carrié in his France, Europe and the two world wars. Westpoint, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1975. p.284, notes that the Parti Radical Socialiste joined the alliance of Socialists and Communists to form the Front Populaire, in the autumn of 1935.
35. A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1.
36. See: F.D. p.200.
37. "Vendredi", "14 juillet 1936 - Notre Serment", Vendredi, No.36, 10 juillet 1936, p.3. The underlining is the author's own.
38. See for example: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.134.
39. See title page of every issue of Vendredi.
40. See: *ibid.*
41. See: F.D. p.207.
42. See: Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.95. This is confirmed by Chamson in his Il faut vivre vieux, p.84. Chamson notes that "le premier numéro a été vendu à 300,000 exemplaires".

43. See for example: Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.106, where she notes that after the publication of Gide's "Avant-propos" sales dropped to 200,000. See also: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, pp. 135 and 137, where he notes that sales reached 100,000 by the third issue and dropped to an average of 52,343 after the publication of the "Avant-propos".
44. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1.
45. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.83.
46. For this information and source of quotation, see: *ibid.*, p.84.
47. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.95.
48. For information on this dispensation and the source of the quotation, see: André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.84.
49. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno in their "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1. where the directors thank the Front Populaire parties.
50. See: *ibid.*, p.1.
51. See for example: Alfred Spire, Inventaire des Socialismes français contemporains, p.160.
52. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.102.
53. Alfred Spire in his Inventaire des Socialismes français contemporains, p.158, notes that the Blum government executed the programme of the Front Populaire and not that of the S.F.I.O.
54. For this information and source of quotation, see: "Vendredi", "Au bout d'un an", Vendredi, No.84, 11 juin 1937, p.1.

55. See: "Vendredi", "En attendant mieux", Vendredi, No.13,
31 janvier 1936, p.1.
56. "Vendredi", "Après la victoire", Vendredi, No.27, 8 mai 1936, p.1.
57. See for example: "Vendredi", "Nécessaire et suffisant :
Le Front Populaire", Vendredi, No.45, 11 septembre 1936, p.1.
58. For this information and source of quotation, see:
André Chamson, "Espoirs de la province", Vendredi, No.30,
29 mai 1936, p.1.
59. André Chamson, "De l'espoirs d'hier aux déceptions d'aujourd'hui",
Vendredi, No.118, 4 février 1938, p.1.
60. A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Le sénat contre le pays:
La France aura raison", Vendredi, No.86, 25 juin 1937, p.1.
61. A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Après deux ans: nous
maintiendrons", Vendredi, No.101, 8 octobre 1937, p.1.
62. "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.128, 15 avril
1938, p.3.
63. For this information and source of quotation, see:
Victor Basch, "Un an après la Victoire", Vendredi, No.79,
7 mai 1937, p.1.
64. Jean Guéhenno, "Printemps en France, la République recommence",
Vendredi, No.25, 25 avril 1936, p.1.
65. Jean Guéhenno, "Liberté", Vendredi, No.36, 10 juillet 1936, p.1.
66. Jean Guéhenno, "L'asile du bonheur, ou les devoirs des gens
heureux", Vendredi, No.114, 7 janvier 1938, p.1.
67. Jean Guéhenno, "La foi en soi-même", Vendredi, No.68, 19 février
1937, p.1.

68. For Guéhenno's views on Jaurès and on communism, see:

Jean Guéhenno, "Jean Jaurès ou l'Appel à la Raison",
Vendredi, No.39, 31 juillet 1936, p.3.

69. Jean Guéhenno, "Devenons-nous plus bêtes?" Vendredi, No.95,
26 août 1937, p.1.

70. Jean Guéhenno, "Devoirs de la France", Vendredi, No.50,
16 octobre 1936, p.1.

71. A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Le sénat contre le
pays: La France aura raison", Vendredi, No.86, 25 juin 1937,
p.1. This is confirmed by "Vendredi" in "Aux idées justes
les faits répondent", Vendredi, No.47, 25 septembre 1936,
p.1. It is also confirmed by the anonymous author of
"Devant la crise. Et Après?", Vendredi, No.123, 11 mars 1938, p.1.

72. See: "Vendredi", "Aux idées justes les faits répondent",
Vendredi, No.47, 25 septembre 1936, p.1.

73. A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi",
Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1.

74. The anonymous author of "Les écrivains en campagne",
Vendredi, No.27, 8 mai 1936, p.1. notes that Chamson spoke
in Montreuil, Villersomble, Vincennes and Sceaux, Guéhenno
spoke for Piot and Croizat, whilst Cassou spoke in Montreuil
and Saint-Maudé. This is confirmed by Madeleine Berry in
her André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.99, who notes:
"ils ne se contentent pas d'écrire des articles... ils vont
prononcer de nombreux discours dans tous les coins de Paris
et de la Banlieue".

75. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.1. where they state that "Vendredi n'a voulu être que son (de Front Populaire) porte-parole", and that they wish to be "le journal de la victoire populaire".
76. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.93.
77. See: "Vendredi", "Nécessaire et suffisant: Le Front Populaire", Vendredi, No.45, 11 septembre 1936, p.1.
78. See: "Vendredi", "À nos amis radicaux", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936, p.1.
79. See: "Vendredi", "Responsabilités Radicales", Vendredi, No.52, 30 octobre 1936, p.1.
80. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Avertissements", Vendredi, No.53, 6 novembre 1936, p.1.
81. See: Jacques Delperrié de Bayac, Histoire du Front Populaire, p.233.
82. See: Marceau Pivert, "Pourquoi j'ai démissionné", Vendredi, No.70, 5 mars 1937, p.1.
83. See: Andre Chamson, "Disciplinés, mais non pas dupes", Vendredi, No.71, 12 mars 1937, p.1.
84. For information on the crisis, see: Comité directeur, "Bataille pour notre liberté", Vendredi, No.75, 9 avril 1937, p.1.
85. For this information and source of quotation, see: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Le sénat contre le pays: La France aura raison", Vendredi, No.86, 25 juin 1937, p.1.

86. See: "Vendredi", "Calculs déjoués", Vendredi, No.88,
9 juillet 1937, p.1.
87. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.108,
26 novembre 1937, p.3.
88. For this information and source of quotation, see: "Vendredi",
"Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.110, 10 décembre 1937, p.3.
89. See: *ibid.*, p.3. This is repeated by "Vendredi" in "Nous
pensons que", Vendredi, No.111, 17 décembre 1937, p.3.
90. For this information and source of quotation, see: "Vendredi",
"Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.113, 31 décembre 1937, p.3.
91. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.112,
24 novembre 1937, p.3.
92. See: Anon., "Le Front Populaire est un serment", Vendredi,
No.116, 21 janvier 1938, p.1.
93. For this information and source of quotation, see: "Vendredi",
"Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.116, 21 janvier 1938, p.3.
94. This is stated by the anonymous author of "On demande à
comprendre", Vendredi, No.117, 28 janvier 1938, p.1.
95. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.120,
18 février 1938, p.3.
96. See: Anon., "Les Nationaux n'ont pas voulu", Vendredi, No.124,
18 mars 1938, p.1.
97. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.124,
18 mars 1938, p.3.

98. "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.125, 25 mars 1938, p.3.
99. Ibid., p.3.
100. Ibid., p.3.
101. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.126, 1 avril 1938, p.3.
102. Ibid., p.3.
103. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.127, 8 avril 1938, p.3.
104. "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.128, 15 avril 1938, p.3.
105. Jean Guéhenno, "Au devant de la vie", Vendredi, No.132, 13 mai 1938, p.1.
106. Ibid., p.1.
107. Comité Directeur, "Déclaration", Vendredi, No.132, 13 mai 1938, p.1.
108. "Vendredi", "Une voie nouvelle s'impose à nous", Vendredi, No.158, 10 novembre 1938, p.1.
109. See: *ibid.*, p.1.
110. Ibid., p.1.
111. See: Victor Basch, "Avant le second tour", Vendredi, No.102, 15 octobre 1938, p.1.
112. See: P. Warwick, The French Popular Front. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1977. p.70.
113. See: "Vendredi", "Où la politique commande le débat", Vendredi, No.48. 2 octobre 1936, p.1.

114. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.114,
7 janvier 1938, p.3.
115. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que" Vendredi, No.122,
4 mars 1938, p.3.
116. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.128,
15 avril 1938, p.3.
117. See: André Wurmser, "Le Sénat: faiblesse de constitution",
Vendredi, No.87, 2 juillet 1937, p.7.
118. See: Paul Gérin, "Les feint pouvoirs", Vendredi, No.87,
2 juillet 1937, p.7.
119. Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Pour vice de constitution il faut
réformer le Sénat", Vendredi, No.128, 15 avril 1938, p.1.
120. "Vendredi" in its "Un "acte" de l'Elysée", Vendredi, No.67,
12 février 1937, p.1, notes the President of the Republic's
reference to foreign press attacks on France, which make use
of arguments put forward in the French press.
121. See: Anon, "Notes politiques", Vendredi, No.147, 26 août
1938, p.1.
122. "Vendredi" in its "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.127, 8 avril
1938, p.3, suggests that the current strikes were provoked
by the Right, in the hope of this leading to an "Union Sacré"
government.
123. Jean Paulhan, in his "Lettre à J. Guéhenno de 1943",
La Nouvelle Revue Française, Paris, Gallimard, XLVIII,
octobre 1976, p.119, accuses Vendredi of being patriotic
only against certain Frenchmen.

124. See: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Que des chiens dévorants", Vendredi, No.94, 20 août 1937, p.1.
125. See: "Vendredi", "Un témoin de moralité", Vendredi, No.104, 29 octobre 1937, p.1.
126. See: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "L'Exécution de M. de la Roque", Vendredi, No. 105, 5 novembre 1937, p.1.
127. See for example: Rene Albrecht-Carrié, France, Europe and the two world wars, p.252.
128. See: Anon, "Les trois affaires Stavisky", Vendredi, No.1. 7 novembre 1935, p.1.
129. See: "Vendredi", Vendredi vous parle...et accuse", Vendredi, No.3, 21 novembre 1935, p.1.
130. See: "Vendredi", "Epargnons le sang de la France", Vendredi, No.72, 19 mars 1937, p.1.
131. See: Anon, "Il faut dissoudre le conseil municipal de Paris", Vendredi, No.81, 21 mai 1937, p.8.
132. Leonard H. Rolfe, The novels of André Chamson. New York, Washington, Hollywood, Vantage Press, 1971. p.74.
133. Ibid., p.80.
134. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.112. André Chamson's La Galère. Paris, Gallimard, 1939, was serialised in La Nouvelle Revue Française, Paris, Gallimard, 1938, L1, juillet pp. 83-117. août pp. 249-278. septembre pp. 416-433. octobre pp. 604-635. novembre pp. 784-788. décembre pp. 1008-1036. Chamson was not therefore alone in regarding the events of the 6th February 1934 as a serious threat to the Republic.

135. André Chamson, in his Il faut vivre vieux, p.82, notes that the purpose of Vendredi was to "dresser face à Candide... un journal... qui s'opposera a l'entreprise fasciste en France".
136. See for example: André Chamson, "Contre la guerre civile", Vendredi, No.6, 13 décembre 1935, p.1.
137. See: "Vendredi", "Ce que l'ordre exige!", Vendredi, No.49, 9 octobre 1936, p.1.
138. See: B. Frachon, "Pour la dissolution des ligues fascistes", Vendredi, No.75, 9 avril 1937, p.6.
139. See: André Wurmser, "Les récidivistes de la provocation", Vendredi, No.103, 27 octobre 1937, p.1.
140. See: André Chamson, "Il y a complot contre les institutions républicaines", Vendredi, No. 108, 26 novembre 1937, p.1.
141. See for example: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.109, 3 décembre 1937, p.3. This is confirmed in "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.110, 10 décembre 1937, p.3, and in "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que" Vendredi, No.111, 17 décembre, p.3.
142. See: Jules Moch, Le Front Populaire, grande espérance. Paris, Librairie Académique Perrin, 1971, p.207.
143. "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.115, 14 janvier 1938, p.3.
144. See: André Ulmann, "Notre enquête sur l'accident de Villejuif", Vendredi, No.118, 4 février 1938, p.6.

145. See: Jacques Arnaud, "Et l'"Affaire du C.S.A.R.?", Vendredi, No.130, 29 avril 1938, p.1.
146. See: André Chamson, "Être modérés ou être fermes ce n'est pas être absurdes", Vendredi, No.136, 10 juin 1938, p.1.
147. See: "Vendredi", "Vers le pouvoir", Vendredi, No.28, 15 mai 1936, p.1.
148. See: Robert Lacoste, "L'unité du patronat", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936, p.4.
149. See: "Vendredi", "Abattez le Mur!", Vendredi, No.78, 30 avril 1937, p.1.
150. See: Anon, "Le franc et la confiance", Vendredi, No.101, 8 octobre 1937, p.2.
151. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.123, 11 mars 1938, p.3.
152. See: J. Dupiol, "Bons de Trésor et avances de la Banque de France", Vendredi, No.34, 26 juin 1936, p.6. This is confirmed by René Albrecht-Carrié in his France, Europe and the two world wars, p.281.
153. See: Flandin, La Revue de Paris, 1 avril 1937. Quoted in Paul Gérin, "Quand les banques gouvernent", Vendredi, No.75, 9 avril 1937, p.3.
154. See: Actionnaire moyen, "Les révoltés de la Banque de France", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936, p.5.
155. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Réponse" (à Léon Jouhaux), Vendredi, No.32, 12 juin 1936, p.1.

156. Georges Lefranc, Le Syndicalisme en France. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, "Que sais-je", 1964. p.63. Jouhaux was particularly opposed to the P.C.F.
157. See: Léon Jouhaux, "La C.G.T. à Vendredi", Vendredi, No.32, 12 juin 1936, p.1.
158. See: Léon Jouhaux, "La nationalisation des industries de guerre", Vendredi, No.39, 31 juillet 1936, p.6.
159. See: Robert Lacoste, "La C.G.T. et les Nationalisations", Vendredi, No.73, 26 mars 1937, p.4.
160. See for example: Anon, "La vague de grèves et sa signification" Vendredi, No.33, 19 juin 1936, p.6.
161. See: René Belin, "Les buts immédiats de l'action syndicale", Vendredi, No.40, 7 août 1936, p.6.
162. Léon Jouhaux, in his "La Classe Ouvrière et l'intérêt général", Vendredi, No.48, 2 octobre 1936, p.8, calls on the workers to create wealth and respect discipline.
163. See: Léon Jouhaux, "L'Expérience réussira", Vendredi, No.53, 6 novembre 1936, p.6.
164. See: *ibid.*, p.6.
165. See: René Belin, "Les buts immédiats de l'action syndicale", Vendredi, No.40, 7 août 1936, p.6.
166. See for example: Léon Jouhaux, "Collaboration, non subordination", Vendredi, No.93, 13 août 1937, p.1.

167. See: Anon., "Le franc et la confiance", Vendredi, No.101,
8 octobre 1937, p.2. This view is repeated by Paul Gérin in
his "La balance commerciale de la France est normalement
déficitaire", Vendredi, No.121, 25 février 1938, p.6.
168. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.12,
24 décembre 1937, p.3.
169. See:"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.113,
31 décembre 1937, p.3.
170. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.126,
1 avril 1938, p.3.
171. Léon Blum, quoted in Jeân Guéhenno, "La foi en soi-même",
Vendredi, No.68, 19 février 1937, p.1.
172. See: Léon Jouhaux, "Le Grand Capital et les intérêts du
pays", Vendredi, No.57, 4 décembre 1936, p.4.
173. See for example: F. Delaisi, "La défense des classes moyennes",
Vendredi, No.62, 8 janvier 1937, p.1.
174. See: Marcel Braiband, "Comment les paysans sont spoliés
par les trusts", Vendredi, No.99, 23 septembre 1937, p.6.
175. See for example: J. Duret, "Le déficit budgetaire", Vendredi,
No.69, 12 février 1937, p.4.
176. See for example: J. Dupiol, "Bons du Trésor et avances de
la Banque de France", Vendredi, No.34, 26 juin 1936, p.6.
This view is repeated by A.P. in his "Et les grands travaux?",
Vendredi, No.54, 13 novembre 1936, p.4.
177. See: Léon Jouhaux, "La dernière chance du libéralisme",
Vendredi, No.71, 12 mars 1937, p.1.

178. See: Georges Duveau, "Proudhon, précurseur du Front Populaire", Vendredi, No.32, 12 juin 1936, p.5.
179. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.119, 11 février 1938, p.3.
180. Paul Gérin, "Les fraudeurs de l'impôt", Vendredi, No.70, 5 mars 1937, p.3.
181. Paul Gérin, "Pourquoi créer une École d'Administration?", Vendredi, No.114, 7 janvier 1938, p.1.
182. "Vendredi", "Marche du Peuple de Paris, 16 février 1936", Vendredi, No.16, 21 février 1936, p.1.
183. See: André Delmas, "La réforme de l'enseignement", Vendredi, No.71, 12 mars 1937, p.4.
184. See: E. et G. Lefranc, "Nationalisation de l'enseignement", Vendredi, No. 49, 9 octobre 1936, p.4.
185. See: C. Freinet, "Pour l'Education nouvelle", Vendredi, No.21, 27 mars 1936, p.8.
186. For information on this school and the source of the quotation, see: Paul Gérin, "l'École de l'avenir", Vendredi, No.85, 18 juin 1937, p.7.
187. See: Edmond Schlesinger, "On peut sauver l'enfance coupable", Vendredi, No.97, 9 septembre 1937, p.6.
188. See: Edmond Schlesinger, "Admiration dangereuse", Vendredi, No.30, 29 mai 1936, p.8.
189. See: Edmond Schlesinger, "Une question délicate", Vendredi, No.118, 4 février 1938, p.7.

190. See for example: "Vendredi de la femme", Vendredi, No.4,
28 novembre 1935, p.12.
191. See: Colette Aynard, "Jusqu'à nouvel ordre", Vendredi, No.15,
14 février 1936, p.12.
192. See for example: M. Lahy-Hollesbecque, "L'enfant et le travail
professionnel", Vendredi, No.13, 31 janvier 1936, p.12.
193. A. Viollis, "Les femmes pour la liberté", Vendredi, No.17,
28 février 1936, p.1.
194. See: A. Viollis, "Trois femmes ministres", Vendredi, No.32,
12 juin 1936, p.1.
195. Germaine Robert Castro, "L'avenement des femmes dans les
syndicats", Vendredi, No.71, 12 mars 1937, p.9.
196. See: Collette Aynard-Thumen, "Le divorce et les femmes",
Vendredi, No.87, 2 juillet 1937, p.8.
197. See: Léon Blum, Du Mariage, in L'Oeuvre de Léon Blum, vol. 1905-
1914, Paris, Édit. Albin Michel, 1962. p.168.
198. See: *ibid.*, p.169.
199. See: Magdeleine Paz, "Femmes à vendre", Vendredi, No.32,
12 juin 1936, p.7. This series of articles continued in
the next five issues of the paper.
200. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.85.
201. Andre Chamson, "À la jeunesse", Vendredi, No.98, 16 septembre
1937, p.1.
202. See: Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre
l'Histoire, p.101.

203. For André Chamson's views on French youth, see for example his "Jeunesse d'Aujourd'hui... Au devant de la vie", Vendredi, No.42, 21 août 1936, p.1.
204. See for example: André Chamson, "Que la Jeunesse bâtit sa ville", Vendredi, No. 143, 29 juillet 1938, p.1.
205. See for example: André Chamson, "J'aime à camper quand il fait beau", Vendredi, No.127, 8 avril 1938, p.8.
206. Louis Guilloux, "À la Jeunesse", Vendredi, No.17, 28 février 1936, p.1.
207. André Hoschiller, "La journée internationale pour la défense de la paix", Vendredi, No.82, 28 mai 1937, p.7.
208. See: André Combe, "Autour de la Journée Internationale de la Jeunesse", Vendredi, No.94, 20 août 1937, p.6.
209. See: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Christianisme et révolution", Vendredi, No.32, 12 juin 1936, p.3.
210. See: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi!", Vendredi, No.69, 26 février 1937, p.1.
211. Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Main tendue et main tirée", Vendredi, No.113, 31 décembre 1937, p.1.
212. See: *ibid.*, p.1.
213. See: A. Viollis et Françoise Lassagne, "Assez de comédie autour du drame espagnol", Vendredi, No.86, 25 juin 1937, p.3.

214. Jean Guéhenno, in his "Sur la naissance de la III République", Vendredi, No.97, 9 septembre 1937, p.1. states that the Treaty of Versailles was "une de nos plus grands erreurs". He restates this view in "Au fond de l'Absurde: le pacifisme n'est pas une tactique", Vendredi, No.26, 1 mai 1936, p.1, where he refers to "la stupide traité de Versailles".
215. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Briand le précurseur", Vendredi, No.18, 6 mars 1936, p.1.
216. Louis Martin-Chauffier, in his "Briand l'obstiné", Vendredi, No.85, 18 juin 1937, p.1. quotes Guéhenno's views on this matter.
217. See: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Briand l'obstiné", Vendredi, No.85, 18 juin 1937, p.1.
218. See: René Albrecht-Carrié, France, Europe and the two world wars, p.268.
219. See: A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Lettre à Pierre Laval", Vendredi, No.4, 28 novembre 1935, p.1.
220. See: Léon Noël, La guerre de '39 a commencé quatre ans plus tôt". Paris, Éditions France-Empire, 1979. p.35.
221. See: Andrée Viollis, "Attentat contre la paix", Vendredi, No.7, 20 décembre 1935, p.1.
222. See: Jean Guéhenno, "La guerre est à droite", Vendredi, No.10, 11 janvier 1936, p.1.
223. See: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Quand M. Pierre Laval passera en Haut Cour", Vendredi, No.35, 2 juillet 1936, p.1.
224. See: René Albrecht-Carrié, France, Europe and the two world wars, p.286.

225. F. Delaisi, in his "Comment le Comité des Forges fait payer aux Français le réarmement allemand", Vendredi, No.22, 3 avril 1934, p.1, states that Laval did not restrict French export of iron ore to Germany, despite knowing its intended use, because he did not wish to upset mine owner de Wendel.
226. See for example: "Vendredi", "Paroles de paix, actes de guerre", Vendredi, No.95, 26 août 1937, p.1.
227. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No. 101, 8 octobre 1937, p.3.
228. Léon Limon, in his "Où va l'Autriche", Vendredi, No.71, 12 mars 1937, p.4. states that Italian involvement in Ethiopia endangers Austria, which is dependent for its security on Italy.
229. See: Imré Gyomai, "À la veille d'un nouveau coup de théâtre hitlérien", Vendredi, No.76, 16 avril 1937, p.6.
230. See: René Albrecht-Carrié, France, Europe and the two world wars, p.276.
231. See for example: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.101, 8 octobre 1937, p.3.
232. The anonymous author of "Banques Partout", Vendredi, No.116, 21 janvier 1938, states that France should not hesitate over imposing exchange controls, simply because Britain would disapprove.
233. "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.109, 3 décembre p.3.
234. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.127, 8 avril 1938, p.1.
235. See: Léon Noël, La guerre de '39 a commencé quatre ans plus tôt, p.41.

236. See: René Albrecht-Carrié, France, Europe and the two world wars, p.299.
237. See: Rivet Langevin, Alain, "Déclaration", Vendredi, No.19, 13 mars 1936, p.2.
238. For André Chamson's views on this matter and source of quotation, see his "Politique intérieure de l'Europe", Vendredi, No.20, 20 mars 1936, p.1.
239. See: André Wurmser, "Les sanctions plus que jamais!", Vendredi, No.28, 15 mai 1936, p.1.
240. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.113, 31 décembre 1937, p.3.
241. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.124, 18 mars 1938, p.3.
242. Andrée Viollis, "Vienne sous la botte Nazie", Vendredi, No.125, 25 mars 1938, p.1.
243. For this information and source of quotation, see: "Vendredi", "La grande semaine diplomatique", Vendredi, No.130, 24 avril 1938, p.1.
244. Andrée Viollis, "Pitié pour les oiseaux", Vendredi, No.131, 6 mai 1938, p.1.
245. "Vendredi", "Face à l'Axe Berlin-Rome", Vendredi, No.132, 13 mai 1938, p.2.
246. See: Léon Blum et Paul Boncour, "Sur la Crise", Le Temps, 16 mars 1938.

247. André Chamson, "Echec à la guerre", Vendredi, No.134,
27 mai 1938, p.1.
248. See: Léon Noël, La guerre de '39 a commencé quatre ans
plus tôt, p.77.
249. See: Philippe Diole, "Tchécoslovaquie 1938", Vendredi,
No.141, 15 juillet 1938, p.1.
250. This is stated by the anonymous author of "Notes Politiques",
Vendredi, No.148, 2 septembre 1938, p.1.
251. See: "Vendredi" "Le calvaire de la paix", Vendredi, No.152,
30 septembre 1938, p.1.
252. This is stated by the anonymous author of "Les deux bras
de la Croix - Tchécoslovaquie", Vendredi, No.153,
7 octobre 1938, p.1.
253. See: "Vendredi", "Établir enfin la paix", Vendredi, No.153,
7 octobre 1938, p.1.
254. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat
of the end of 1938. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
255. "Vendredi", in its "Notes Politiques", Vendredi, No.155,
21 octobre 1938, p.1, notes the divisions over Munich.
256. "Vendredi", "Notes Politiques", Vendredi, No.151,
23 septembre 1938, p.1.
257. "Vendredi", in its "Les quatre coins", Vendredi, No.61,
1 janvier 1937, p.1, calls for new credits to Germany to
be made conditional upon a halt to further rearmament.

258. "Vendredi", in its "Notre ami Robinson et les comptes du Brésil", Vendredi, No.107, 19 novembre 1937, p.2, calls on France to put economic pressure on Brazil, to show its displeasure at Vargas' attempt to introduce a fascist régime.
259. "Vendredi", in its "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.111, 17 décembre 1937, p.3, suggests cutting oil exports to Japan in order to halt its aggression in China.
260. "Vendredi", in its "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.119, 11 février 1938, p.3, suggests Britain should use Italian dependence on British credits to influence Italian policies.
261. See: Andrée Viollis, "Les femmes pour la liberté", Vendredi, No. 17, 28 février 1936, p.1.
262. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.102.
263. See: André Wurmser, "Il n'y a pas de Pyrénées", Vendredi, No.38, 24 juillet 1936, p.1.
264. See: G. Pasamonte, "En Espagne - Treize jours de guerre civile", Vendredi, No.39, 1 août 1936, p.1.
265. For Andrée Viollis' views on Spain and the source of the quotation, see her "Le miracle du peuple Espagnol", Vendredi, No.44, 4 septembre 1936, p.1.
266. See: Elie Richard, "Comment a été préparée la rebellion des généraux espagnols", Vendredi, No.44, 4 septembre 1936, p.2.
267. See: Alain Decaux, Discours..., p.17.
268. See: Angel Galarza, "Les Dessous de la rebellion", Vendredi, No.40, 7 août 1936, p.3.

269. See for example: "Vendredi", "Tourjours la paix", Vendredi, No.64, 22 janvier 1967, p.1.
270. See: André Chamson, "Avis à nos traitres", Vendredi, No.40, 7 août 1936, p.1.
271. See: André Chamson, "La Justice est indivisible. Madrid en flammes", Vendredi, No.55, 20 novembre 1936, p.1.
272. André Chamson, "Le vrai pacifisme", Vendredi, No.67, 12 février 1937, p.1.
273. See: *ibid.*, p.1.
274. See: André Chamson, "Tervel : Méditation sur une victoire", Vendredi, No. 115, 14 janvier 1938, p.1.
275. André Chamson, "Les métamorphoses de la guerre", Vendredi, No.92, 6 août 1937, p.3.
276. See: *ibid.*, p.6.
277. Madeleine Berry, Andre Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.107. This is confirmed by Leonard H. Rolfe in his The Novels of André Chamson, p.66, where he states that "Retour d'Espagne has little of the political case for the Republican side, the book is devoted mainly to a horror of war and its specialists".
278. See: A.A. "Le fascisme italien et l'huile espagnol", Vendredi, No.93, 13 août 1937, p.8.
279. See: Andrée Viollis, "Madrid encore", Vendredi, No.73, 26 mars 1937, p.1.
280. See: André Malraux, "Guadalajara", Vendredi, No.11, 17 décembre 1937, p.1.

281. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.111,
17 décembre 1937, p.3.
282. See: Raymond Laubier, "Rumeurs sur la plage", Vendredi,
No.40, 7 août 1936, p.1.
283. See: Louis Pierard, "Regards sur l'Espagne en feu", Vendredi,
No.41, 14 août 1936, p.3.
284. See: Carlo Rosselli, "Catalogne-bastion de l'Espagne",
Vendredi, No.54, 13 novembre 1936, p.5.
285. See: Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years-Life, vol.4. Eve of War
1933-1941, pp. 125-132.
286. Naom Chomsky, American power and the new mandarins New York,
Random House, Pantheon Books, 1969. p.81.
287. George Orwell, Homage to Catalonia. London, Secker and Warburg,
1959. p.52.
288. Ibid., p.55.
289. Bruno de Cessole, "George Orwell", Valeurs Actuelles,
14 février 1983, pp.32-34.
290. See: Jean-Richard Bloch, "Empêchons le suicide de la France",
Vendredi, No.41, 14 août 1936, p.1.
291. See: "Vendredi", "Responsabilités Radicales", Vendredi,
No.52, 30 octobre 1936, p.1.
292. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.93.
293. See: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "La justice-ennemi public",
Vendredi, No.50, 16 octobre 1936, p.1.

294. See: Paul Nizan, "L'an prochain à Toulouse", Vendredi, No.74,
2 avril 1937, p.1.
295. See: Victor Basch, "Un an après la victoire", Vendredi,
No.79, 7 mai 1937, p.1.
296. Andrée Viollis, "Assez de comédie autour du drame espagnol",
Vendredi, No.86, 25 juin 1937, p.3.
297. For Guéhenno's views on Spain and the source of the quotations,
see his "Examen de Conscience - L'Espagne et l'Europe",
Vendredi, No.88, 9 juillet 1937, p.1.
298. See: Léon Jouhaux, "Retour d'Espagne", Vendredi, No.82,
28 mai 1937, p.1.
299. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.118,
4 février 1938, p.3.
300. See: Andrée Viollis, "Bilbao affamé demande des vivres",
Vendredi, No.78, 30 avril 1937, p.1.
301. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.105,
5 novembre 1937, p.3.
302. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No. 123,
11 mars 1938, p.3.
303. "Vendredi", "Contrôle et non-intervention", Vendredi,
No.89, 16 juillet 1937, p.1.
304. See: "Vendredi", "Heures décisives", Vendredi, No. 96,
2 septembre 1937, p.1.
305. See: Léon Jouhaux, "Indépendance, Force, Raison", Vendredi,
No.58, 11 décembre 1936, p.1.

306. See: Anon, "Le Congrès Radical", Vendredi, No.104,
29 octobre 1937, p.2.
307. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.90.
308. Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire,
p.102.
309. See: André Chamson, "La justice est indivisible", Vendredi,
No.55, 20 novembre 1936, p.1.
310. For Louis Martin-Chauffier's views on war, see his "Il n'y
a pas deux façons de faire la guerre", Vendredi, No.83,
5 juin 1937, p.1.
311. André Chamson, in his Il faut vivre vieux, p.89, states:
"l'ascension (de Vendredi) a duré... jusqu'au début de la
guerre d'Espagne".
312. Alfred Spire, in his Inventaire des Socialismes français
contemporains, p. 197, states that the P.C.F. was against
non-intervention.
313. See: Paul Louis, "Le jeu de la diplomatie italienne",
Vendredi, No.62, 8 janvier 1937, p.4.
314. See: Léon Noël, La guerre de '39 a commencé quatre ans plus
tôt, p.36.
315. See: A. Dutheil, "Vrais responsables des assassinats",
Vendredi, No.2, 14 novembre 1935, p.3.
316. See: André Chamson, "Que l'habilité cède au courage!",
Vendredi, No.99, 23 septembre 1937, p.1.

317. See: Julien Benda, "Hypocrisies fascistes", Vendredi, No.52, 30 octobre 1936, p.1.
318. See: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Lettre ouverte à Mussolini", Vendredi, No.149, 9 septembre 1938, p.1.
319. For this information and source of quotation, see Anon. "Quand l'Italie devient raciste", Vendredi, No.149, 9 septembre 1938, p.2.
320. Philippe Viet, "Claude Polin - Le totalitarisme", Valeurs Actuelles, 14 février 1983, p.30.
321. Claude Polin, Le totalitarisme. Quoted in ibid., p.30.
322. See: Andrée Viollis, "Quelque notes sur Berlin", Vendredi, No.12, 24 janvier 1936, p.1.
323. See: Andrée Viollis, "L'acte d'accusation contre Thaelmann et son néant", Vendredi, No.23, 10 avril 1936, p.7.
324. See: Charles Reber, "Catholiques et communistes dans le III Reich", Vendredi, No.79, 7 mai 1937, p.3.
325. For this information and source of quotation, see: Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Le Juif et l'Allemand - vus par les hitlériens", Vendredi, No.65, 29 janvier 1937, p.3.
326. See: Jean Lévy-Besombes, "Je reviens d'Allemagne", Vendredi, No.152, 30 septembre 1938, p.3.
327. See: Prof Edmond Vermeil, "La crise du III Reich", Vendredi, No.119, 11 février 1938, p.1.
328. For this information and source of quotation, see: Jean Prévost, "La propagande est Maladive", Vendredi, No. 140, 8 juillet 1938, p.1.

329. For Philippe Dirole's views and the source of the quotation, see his "Comment l'Allemagne est Hitlérienne", Vendredi, No.156, 28 octobre 1938, p.3.
330. For Guéhenno's views on Nazism and the source of the quotations, see his "Ce que c'est qu'un Nazi", Vendredi, No.77, 23 avril 1937, p.1.
331. Vendredi devotes only a very minor article to book burning. See: Anon., "M. le dr. Goebbels "protecteur" du livre", Vendredi, No.140, 1 juillet 1938, p.4.
332. See for example, P. Gérin, "M. Van Zeeland - sauvera-t-il son malade", Vendredi, No.118, 4 février 1938, p.1.
333. For this information and source of quotation, see: *ibid.*, p.1.
334. "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.122, 4 mars 1938, p.3. This is confirmed by "Vendredi" in its "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.103, 27 octobre 1937, p.3.
335. See: Wickham Steed, "Élections en Angleterre", Vendredi, No.3, 21 novembre 1935, p.3.
336. See: James Lloyd, "La loi anglaise sur la Presse", Vendredi, No.57, 4 décembre 1936, p.3.
337. See: Wickham Steed, "Explication de l'Angleterre", Vendredi, No.59, 18 décembre 1936, p.1.
338. See: G.B. Shaw, "La pseudo-crise constitutionnelle de la Grande-Bretagne", Vendredi, No.63, 15 janvier 1937, p.3.
339. See Vendredi's introduction to Wickham Steed, "Explication de l'Angleterre", Vendredi, No.59, 18 décembre 1936, p.1.

340. For this information and source of quotation, see:

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.122,
4 mars 1938, p.3.

341. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.123,
11 mars 1938, p.3.

342. See: Anon, "Que veut l'Angleterre", Vendredi, No.154,
14 octobre 1938, p.2.

343. See: A. Habaru, "Le "rexisme", fascisme belge", Vendredi,
No.20, 20 mars 1936, p.4.

344. For Nizan's views on Rexism, see his "La journée Bruxelloise",
Vendredi, No.52, 30 octobre 1936, p.4.

345. See: Emile Vandervelde, "Restons vigilants", Vendredi,
No.76, 16 avril 1937, p.1.

346. See: Francis Jourdain, "L'hitlérisme en Roumanie",
Vendredi, No.25, 24 avril 1936, p.7.

347. See: Jean Perrigault, "Quand j'étais prisonnier... et
complice des marchands d'opium chinois", Vendredi, No.91,
30 juillet 1937, p.1.

348. "Vendredi", "De l'Ethiopie à la Chine", Vendredi, No.94,
20 août 1937, p.1.

349. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.108,
26 novembre 1937, p.3.

350. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.115,
14 janvier 1938, p.3.

351. See: "Vendredi", "L'Encyclique du Prés. Roosevelt",
Vendredi, No.10. 10 janvier 1936, p.1.

352. See: Pierre Brossolette, "Franklin Roosevelt", Vendredi, No.13, 31 janvier 1936, p.3.
353. For Emil Ludwig's views on Roosevelt and the source of the quotation, see his "Roosevelt", Vendredi, No.134, 27 mai 1938, p.3.
354. See: François Crucy, "Roosevelt et les Maîtres du Crédit", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936, p.4.
355. See: Paul Gérin, "La Cour Suprême contre la démocratie", Vendredi, No.67, 12 février 1937, p.3.
356. See: "Vendredi", "Quelques lueurs - l'initiative du Président Roosevelt", Vendredi, No.44, 4 septembre 1936, p.1.
357. See: "Vendredi", "Les Quatre Coins", Vendredi, No.56, 27 novembre 1936, p.1.
358. Leon Blum quoted in "Vendredi", "Forces de liberté", Vendredi, No.69, 26 février 1937, p.1.
359. See: Edmond Vermeil, "Après la rencontre des deux dictateurs", Vendredi, No.100, 30 septembre 1937, p.1.
360. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.101, 8 octobre 1937, p.3.
361. For Guéhenno's views on America and the source of the quotations, see his "Ce que peuvent des paroles simples et pures", Vendredi, No. 102, 15 octobre 1937, p.1.
362. See: Charles Vildrac, "Aspects de l'U.R.S.S.", Vendredi, No.12, 14 janvier 1936, p.8.

363. See: Joe Bousquet, "Le voyage soviétique de Louis Fischer", Vendredi, No.36, 10 juillet 1936, p.4.
364. For Simone Téry's view of Koltzov and the Soviet Press, see her "Une grande figure soviétique - Michel Koltzov", Vendredi, No.18, 6 mars 1936, p.4.
365. Romain Rolland, "Adieu à Gorki", Vendredi, No.34, 19 juin 1936, p.5.
366. See: David Caute, The Fellow Travellers, p.85.
367. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Chant de confiance en Russie", Vendredi, No.16, 21 février 1936, p.1.
368. For Guéhenno's view of the trials and the source of the quotation, see his "Devoirs de la France", Vendredi, No.50, 16 octobre 1936, p.1.
369. Alain Decaux, Discours..., p.18.
370. See: David Caute, Communism and the French Intellectuals 1914-1960, p.86.
371. See: *ibid.*, p.131.
372. See: *ibid.*, pp. 131-135.
373. See: David Caute, The Fellow Travellers, p.117.
374. For Guéhenno's views in his second account of the Trials and the source of the quotations, see his "Les procès de Moscou - La Mort inutile", Vendredi, No.66, 5 février 1937, p.1.
375. See: David Caute, Communism and the French Intellectuals 1914-1960, p.132.
376. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, pp. 171-172.

377. David Caute, in his Communism and the French Intellectuals 1914-1960, p.132, states that Gide and Wurmser in particular, attacked Guéhenno for this statement. This was confirmed by Mme. Annie Guéhenno in conversation with the author on the 13th May 1984.
378. See: F.D. pp.216 and 218.
379. See: *ibid.*, p.217.
380. See: *ibid.*, p.219.
381. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.111, 17 décembre 1937, p.3.
382. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.112, 24 décembre 1937, p.3.
383. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.122, 4 mars 1938, p.3.
384. Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Huit jours en l'U.R.S.S.", Vendredi, No.98, 16 septembre 1937, p.1.
385. For this information see: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, pp. 158-159.
386. See: David Caute, The Fellow Travellers, pp. 97-98.
387. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, pp. 159-160.
388. For this information and source of quotations, see: Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, pp. 104-105.
389. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.96.
390. *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.

391. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.162.
392. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.94.
393. See: Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.105.
394. For this information and source of quotations, see Pierre Herbart, "À propos de Retour de l'U.R.S.S. Lettre à André Gide", Vendredi, No.55, 20 novembre 1936, p.1.
395. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.164.
396. See: *ibid.*, p.164.
397. See: André Gide, "Il va de soi", Vendredi, No.64, 22 janvier 1937, p.1..
398. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.164.
399. See: Pierre Herbart, "Sur Retour de l'U.R.S.S.", Vendredi, No.65, 29 janvier 1937, p.5.
400. For information on Louis Guilloux's problems on Ce Soir, see his Carnets 1921-1944, pp. 140-152.
401. See: David Caute, Communism and the French Intellectuals 1914-1960. p.121.
402. See: Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire, p.106.
403. See: David Caute, The Fellow travellers, p.157.
404. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.165.
405. For information on the Gide - Vendredi dispute, see: J.R. pp.213-240.
406. For this information and source of quotations, see: Jean Guéhenno, "Lettre ouverte à A. Gide", Vendredi, No.111, 17 décembre 1937, p.1.

407. For this information and source of the quotation, see:
André Gide, "Lettre ouverte d'André Gide à Vendredi",
Vendredi, No.112, 24 décembre 1937, p.1.
408. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Réponse à A. Gide", Vendredi, No.112,
24 décembre 1937, p.1.
409. For this information and source of the quotations, see:
Jean Guéhenno, "L'asile du bonheur... ou les devoirs des gens
heureux", Vendredi, No.114, 7 janvier 1938, p.1.
410. See: Eugène Dabit, Journal Intime (1928-1936). Paris,
Gallimard, 1939. Entry for the 4th February 1933, p.137.
411. See: André Gide, The journals of André Gide, vol.111, trans.
Justin O'Brien. London, Secker and Warburg, 1949.
Entry for the 3rd August 1935, pp. 325-327.
412. André Malraux, in his "Écrivains, culture, guerre", Vendredi,
No.1, 7 novembre 1935, p.3, states that colonialism is not
the sole method of Europeanisation, because the most
Europeanised foreign countries such as Turkey, are independent.
413. See: Andrée Viollis, "Problème colonial", Vendredi, No.4,
28 novembre 1935, p.8.
414. For a more detailed account of Andrée Viollis' views on
Indochina, see her Indochine S.O.S. Paris, Gallimard, 1935.
415. See: Andrée Viollis, "Ce qu'attend l'Indochine", Vendredi,
No. 33, 19 juin 1936, p.7.

416. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Tunisie 1938", Vendredi, No.145, 12 août 1938, p.1. This is confirmed in the unpublished letters from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of May 1937 and June 1938 (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno), in which Guéhenno writes of being in Algiers and Tunisia respectively.
417. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Dix jours d'Algérie, ou la misère au soleil", Vendredi, No.85, 18 juin 1937, p.1.
418. For Guéhenno's views on Tunisia and the source of the quotations, see his "Tunisie 1938", Vendredi, No.145, 12 août 1938, p.1.
419. See: "Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.105, 5 novembre 1937, p.3.
420. See: Jean Perrigault, "Les premières réformes pour le Maroc sont accordées", Vendredi, No.107, 19 novembre 1937, p.1.
421. See: "Vendredi", "Responsabilités Radicales", Vendredi, No. 52, 30 octobre 1936, p.1.
422. For an account of Guéhenno's moral position and the source of the quotations, see his "Printemps en France, La République recommence", Vendredi, No.25, 24 avril 1936, p.1.
423. Jean Guéhenno, "Pour le 1. mai. Fête d'Hercule", Vendredi, No.26, 1 mai 1936, p.1.
424. For Guéhenno's views and the source of the quotations, see his "Liberté", Vendredi, No.36, 10 juillet 1936, p.1.
425. For Guéhenno's views on this matter and the source of the quotation, see his "Au fond de l'Absurde: le pacifisme n'est pas une tactique", Vendredi, No.126, 1 avril 1938, p.1.

426. For this statement of Guéhenno's position and the source of the quotations, see his "Jean Jaurès ou l'Appel à la Raison", Vendredi, No.39, 31 juillet 1936, p.3.
427. See: Louis Pierard, "Le PEN Club comdemne le fascisme", Vendredi, No.46, 18 septembre 1936, p.3.
428. See: "Déclaration (du C.V.I.A.-F.)", Vendredi, No.19, 13 mars 1936, p.2.
429. Congrès International des écrivains pour la défense de la culture, "Un Message", Vendredi, No.89, 16 juillet 1937, p.1.
430. See: Andrée Viollis, "Portraits animés. Romain Rolland", Vendredi, No.61, 1 janvier 1937, p.7.
431. See: Simone Téry, "Un écrivain soldat-Gustave Regler", Vendredi, No.144, 5 août 1938, p.5.
432. For Emil Ludwig's views and the source of the quotation, see: Jacques Arnaud, "Ce que pense M. Emil Ludwig de l'action des écrivains sur la politique", Vendredi, No.155, 21 octobre 1938, p.1.
433. See: Lucie Mazaauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie, p.162.
434. Jean Sarocchi, Julien Benda-Portrait d'un intellectuel, p.55.
435. See: Eugène Dabit, "Quatre poètes d'U.R.S.S.", Vendredi, No.7, 20 décembre 1935, p.5.
436. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Le héros de l'Europe", Vendredi, No.12, 24 janvier 1936, p.5.
437. See: Romain Rolland, "Adieu à Gorki", Vendredi, No.35, 3 juillet 1936, p.5.

438. See: Julien Benda, "Littérature et idéologie", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936, p.6.
439. See: Henri Polles, "La mauvaise reputation des Hommes de Lettres", Vendredi, No.95, 26 août 1937, p.4.
440. Robert Brasillach, "Causerie littéraire. Jean Guéhenno - Journal d'une "Révolution"", Action Française, 11 mai 1939, p.7.
441. For Nizan's views on literature, see his "Une littérature responsable", Vendredi, No.1. 7 novembre 1935, p.4.
442. See: Paul Nizan, "L'ennemi public No.1.", Regards, No.61, 4 mars 1935.
443. See: Julien Benda, La Trahison des clercs, p.145.
444. See: *ibid.*, p.163.
445. Robert J. Niess, Julien Benda. Michigan, The University of Michigan Press, 1956. p.152.
446. For John Lehmann's views on the English poets, see his "La politique et les poètes anglais", Vendredi, No.39, 31 juillet 1936, p.5.
447. See: François Lassagne, "Une semaine de Théâtre Populaire. Le 14 juillet de Romain Rolland", Vendredi, No.38, 24 juillet 1936, p.3.
448. For Guéhenno's views on Dabit and the source of the quotation, see his "À un ami", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936, p.11.
449. See: Lucien Descaves, "Littérature et journalisme", Vendredi, No.30, 29 mai 1936, p.1.

450. Patrick McCarthy, Céline. London, Allen Lane, 1975. p.169.
451. Ibid., p.167.
452. For René Lalou's views on Marxism and literature, see his "Le Marxisme et la littérature", Vendredi, No.49, 9 octobre 1936, p.7.
453. Pierre Bost, "Il n'y a pas tant de bons livres", Vendredi, No.106, 12 novembre 1937, p.5.
454. For Marcelle Loutrel's views and the source of the quotation, see her "Le livre et le public", Vendredi, No.47, 25 septembre 1936, p.5.
455. Pierre Bost, "Livre pas mort", Vendredi, No.79, 7 mai 1937, p.4.
456. Georges Lubin, "Vendue... le jour de ses vingt ans", Vendredi, No.72, 19 mars 1937, p.9.
457. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Devenons nous plus bêtes?", Vendredi, No.95, 26 août 1937, p.1.
458. For Guéhenno's views on radio and the source of the quotations, see his "La radio et l'esprit", Vendredi, No.116, 21 janvier 1938, p.5.
459. See: Edmond Schlesinger, "Pestalozzi n'est pas mort", Vendredi, No.91, 30 juillet 1937, p.6.
460. See: Henri Polles, "La Jeunesse littéraire d'aujourd'hui", Vendredi, No.141, 15 juillet 1938, p.5.
461. For Luc Durtain's views on culture and the source of the quotations, see his "Une culture peut-elle être immortelle", Vendredi, No.73, 26 mars 1937, p.6.

462. For the views of E. and G. Lefranc and the source of the quotations, see their "La portée psychologique de la culture ouvrière", Vendredi, No.35, 3 juillet 1936, p.8.
463. For Romain Rolland's views on Antonio Gramsci, see his "Antonio Gramsci", Vendredi, No.84, 11 juin 1937, p.4.
464. For Antonio Gramsci's views and the source of the quotation, see: Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci. Trans. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1971. pp.25-26.
465. See: José Bruyr, "Chaud le Jazz", Vendredi, No.108, 26 novembre 1937, p.5.
466. See: Pierre Bost, "Le Cinéma", Vendredi, No. 132, 13 mai 1938, p.6.
467. For Fritz Hoff's views and the source of the quotations, see his "Paris et la littérature allemande", Vendredi, No.87, 2 juillet 1937, p.4.
468. See: Anon, "M.le dr. Goebbels, "protecteur" du livre" , Vendredi, No.140, 8 juillet 1938, p.4.
469. See: Louis Pierard, "Le PEN Club condamne le fascisme", Vendredi, No.46, 18 septembre 1936, p.3.
470. See: Berthold Hinz, Art in the Third Reich. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1980. Introduction.
471. See: *ibid.*, p.47.
472. Irène et Frédéric Joliot-Curie, "Radioactivité", Vendredi, No.3, 21 novembre 1935, p.1.

473. See: Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche, p.137.
474. For André Chamson's recollections of the final period of Vendredi and the source of the quotation, see his Devenir ce qu'on est, pp. 62-63.
475. André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux, p.95.

Chapter Seven

Conclusion: Journal d'une "Révolution"

The possibility of writing "un roman sur la Révolution", was first raised by Guéhenno in a private letter to Romain Rolland, written on the 16th December 1934, shortly after the publication of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans⁽¹⁾. Guéhenno began intensive work on what was to become Journal d'une "Révolution" in the winter of 1936-1937⁽²⁾, but this work was interrupted by the shock of a car accident in which he killed a child on a bicycle⁽³⁾. From the letters to Jean Paulhan it appears that Guéhenno returned to writing in early 1938⁽⁴⁾ and completed the book by December of that year⁽⁵⁾. Initially given the title Journal des vacances, the work did not satisfy Guéhenno⁽⁶⁾, but this did not prevent him from asking Paulhan to publish parts of it in La Nouvelle Revue Française⁽⁷⁾. Paulhan responded favourably to this request, with the result that selected fragments of the Journal des vacances appeared in the March and April editions of the review in 1939⁽⁸⁾. This prefigured the book's official publication under the title Journal d'une "Révolution" in May 1939⁽⁹⁾.

Dedicated to his colleagues on Vendredi André Chamson and Émile Lohner⁽¹⁰⁾, Journal d'une "Révolution" was written by Guéhenno with the intention of finding an order in himself which would help him face the chaos of the world: as he himself states:

"Je voudrais descendre en moi jusqu'à cette région silencieuse où l'on est en face de soi-même, sans fiction et sans artifice, parce que sans témoin... C'est là l'humanité en nous et c'est là qu'est notre sûreté, dans ce profond terreau de souvenirs, d'instincts et de volontés... accumulé(s) par les générations" (J.R. p.17).

The central issue of Journal d'une "Révolution" however is revolution or more particularly, what the term means to the author. Guéhenno's general approach is to outline the origins of revolution as understood by himself and to relate this to religion⁽¹¹⁾, as well as to his childhood memories⁽¹²⁾. In so doing he once more puts forward his view that revolution is a spiritual concept affecting the individual consciousness, as well as being a social force⁽¹³⁾. By relating revolution to rationality⁽¹⁴⁾ and treating it as an idea, Guéhenno is also able to relate revolution to pacifism, by arguing that violence is morally wrong and counter-revolutionary⁽¹⁵⁾. Turning his attention to history, he reinterprets it as a reflection of the revolutionary ideal through the centuries⁽¹⁶⁾ and at the same time dismisses Right-wing historical models. Finally, returning once again to the problem of communism and the Soviet influence, Guéhenno presents the conflict between the liberal intellectual and the communist proletarian⁽¹⁷⁾ in a dialogue which recalls the arguments of Caliban parle and Conversion à l'humain. Nevertheless, although these are the major themes of Journal d'une "Révolution", it is the minor themes which account for the interest of this work. What is important in Journal d'une "Révolution" is the reassessment of the Front Populaire experience, the re-evaluation of the intellectual's role in that movement, the critique of "engagement" and the general move to an apolitical, even conservative position. The book is therefore characterised by a dual perspective. On the one hand it sums up Guéhenno's writing of the 1920s and 1930s because it restates earlier ideas,

but on the other it looks forward to his post-1940 work, since it rejects intellectual involvement in political matters and implicitly recommends traditional intellectual detachment.

As a reassessment of the Front Populaire experience Journal d'une "Révolution" represents without doubt a highly critical view. There is no mistaking the irony in Guéhenno's rhetorical question, posed near the beginning of this work:

"Qu'est devenue la foi qui soulevait les foules dans ces grandes journées de 1935, 1936, quand il semblait que de nouveau la justice et la liberté "guidaient nos pas?" (J.R. p.37).

Looking back on the hopes of those early days Guéhenno is scathing about the naivety displayed by supporters of the Front Populaire: "nous avons sottement espéré que la révolution se ferait dans la facilité" (J.R. p.38). Faced with the political dissolution of the Front Populaire, he is forced to conclude that the experiment of 1935-1936 was ultimately a failure⁽¹⁸⁾. The main justification for this opinion is the view that the Front Populaire wasted an opportunity to change society for the better⁽¹⁹⁾ and the blame for this is put firmly on the political parties which made up the alliance: "Tous les partis, dès l'abord virent le péril: ils craignirent que ce Front populaire ne devînt, comme ils disaient, un "super-parti"" (J.R. pp.207-208). Narrow-minded political partisanship is seen by Guéhenno as the main cause of failure: "la faute de chacun (des partis) fut de ne penser qu'à lui-même et de se préférer au Front Populaire, à la France" (J.R. p.37). Nevertheless he is not entirely happy with this narrowly defined criticism, expressing the viewpoint of Vendredi,

because as usual he wishes to put forward his basic view that ultimate responsibility for all human actions is a matter for each individual consciousness. Consequently every supporter of the Front Populaire must shoulder the burden of responsibility for its failure:

"Les vrais responsables, en fin de compte, c'est nous-mêmes... La défaite de Léon Blum fut notre propre défaite. Il n'a pu faire que ce que nous lui avons permis de faire" (J.R. p.38).

Guéhenno's account of the reasons for the Front Populaire's disintegration is a singularly personal view, not shared by the majority of commentators on this period. Daniel Guérin, arguing from a Trotskyist position in his Front Populaire, révolution manquée, takes the view that the Front Populaire experiment was doomed to fail from the outset, because the Blum government pacified the strikes of 1936 and "une révolution qui cesse d'avancer est condamnée à refluer"⁽²⁰⁾. He dismisses the view that the Blum government was a workers' government⁽²¹⁾, arguing instead that it was a facade which protected the bourgeois régime: "le vieil appareil, intouchable et intouché, conservait la réalité du pouvoir"⁽²²⁾. A different perspective on the Front Populaire is provided by Paul Warwick, who does not hesitate to call it, "an admirable effort to arrive at a policy position that could unite the working and lower middle class parties"⁽²³⁾. Nevertheless Warwick's opinion is that the Front Populaire suffered from too much, rather than too little reform. He believes that the wage increases as well as the paid holidays caused a rapid rise in labour costs without any compensatory rise in production⁽²⁴⁾ and

that this situation was made worse by the introduction of the 40 hour week⁽²⁵⁾. A financial crisis was therefore inevitable, but the government's response of devaluing the Franc in September 1936 "did not render its full share of financial and economic benefits"⁽²⁶⁾. A third account of the performance of the economy during the Front Populaire is given by Jules Moch in his Le Front Populaire, grande espérance. His claim is that economic output actually rose during this period, but that the beneficial aspects of this process were offset by a rise in imports⁽²⁷⁾. It is also his view that the devaluation of September 1936 "n'a pas ému le pays ni affaibli le Front Populaire"⁽²⁸⁾, although like Warwick, Moch accepts that its results were ultimately harmful, because they increased the already high imports⁽²⁹⁾. Moch's outlook clearly points to the importance of non-economic factors in the Front Populaire's decline. He puts forward Spain and rearmament as issues which divided the alliance⁽³⁰⁾, but he does not believe that Blum could have done anything to avoid these Foreign policy problems. Moch's conclusion is that

"la politique étrangère de la France (restait) fidèle aux principes inscrits dans le programme du Front Populaire... Mais l'effort de détente et de paix de Léon Blum (s'appliquait) à une Europe en folie"⁽³¹⁾.

The problem of Spain as a factor in the break-up of the Front Populaire is also considered by Paul Louis⁽³²⁾. Notwithstanding such views however, it is the economic question which dominates the discussion of Front Populaire failure. N. Greene emphasises the misguided reflationary policies pursued by the government and draws attention to the fact that most of the extra money pumped into the economy through wage increases, was spent by the workers on basic commodities

which did not function to stimulate industrial production⁽³³⁾. Furthermore even such dissimilar commentators as Warwick and Guérin, both agree that the Blum government finally fell due to the economic problems that it faced. Guérin claims that in June 1937, it became obvious that the government's efforts to ease the economic crisis were not working⁽³⁴⁾ and Warwick believes that after the Clichy riot labour unrest led to such a serious decline in output, that Blum felt obliged to seek "pleins pouvoirs"⁽³⁵⁾. When the senate refused to grant these powers⁽⁴⁶⁾, Blum finally accepted the failure of his government, as well as the failure of the Front Populaire.

With respect to the presentation of the Front Populaire in Journal d'une "Révolution", A.M.Petitjean's article for La Nouvelle Revue Française gives what is perhaps the most accurate account. Petitjean describes the book as "un témoignage courageux sur l'expérience du Front Populaire"⁽³⁷⁾ and at the same time acknowledges the significance of the peace issue in Guéhenno's evaluation of this experience⁽³⁸⁾. Petitjean correctly notes that "la plume de Guéhenno, si souvent raisonnable et prête à invoquer la raison, tourne folle dès qu'elle entre dans le champ magnétique de la guerre"⁽³⁹⁾. Inevitably therefore, whereas most observers criticise the Front Populaire for its shortcomings in the areas of economic and home policy, Guéhenno's main regret is that it failed to preserve peace in Europe. He recalls how after a day's hunting he returned to his village to find the garde-champêtre pasting up the mobilisation notice: "l'affiche blanche...ce blanc-là je ne l'avais plus revu depuis

vingt-quatre ans, et je savais toute l'horreur qui venait après lui" (J.R. p.197). The intensity of Guéhenno's feelings about war has clearly not diminished since the days when he wrote Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. He makes it clear that in his view "la guerre trahira toujours les espérances des jeunes ouvriers et des jeunes paysans" (J.R. p.160). and blames government leaders for allowing 1913⁽⁴⁰⁾ to repeat itself: "Les nouvelles d'Europe sont mauvaises. C'est la même folie qu'il y a vingt cinq ans. Parmi les "arbitres de l'Europe", les fous ont seulement changé de nom" (J.R. p.155). Although the Front Populaire was no longer in power at the time of the Munich accords, its legacy of inaction on the peace issue led the government of the day to waste what was for Guéhenno a final opportunity to avoid war:

"La parole loyale d'un homme d'État loyal a manqué qui aurait franchement reconnu et dénoncé les fautes du passé et fait ainsi de l'accord de Munich un recommencement" (J.R. p.199).

Faced with what he considered to be the inevitability of war, Guéhenno uses the Journal d'une "Révolution", to justify his own actions on the subject of peace and to distance himself from Front Populaire policies on this matter. Speaking only for himself and other pacifist writers he claims that "nous avons fait, pour la plupart, tout ce que nous avons pu (pour empêcher la guerre)" (J.R. p.158). Nonetheless he acknowledges the failure of these efforts and therefore resigns himself to despair:

"l'Europe pouvait mourir demain... Je (sens) une sorte de rage impuissante. (J'ai) perdu tout sens du ridicule. J'écrivis dix brouillons d'une lettre publique que je voulais adresser au chancelier Hitler" (J.R. p.196).

There is little doubt that Guéhenno's views on war are now purely personal and he makes this quite clear when he vows never to write in the event of war⁽⁴¹⁾.

The re-evaluation of the intellectual's role in the Front Populaire, as presented in Journal d'une "Révolution", begins with a discussion of the general problems facing the intellectual and bears a marked similarity to the arguments of Caliban parle. Guéhenno attempts to resolve certain ambiguities concerning his view of the intellectual in the dialogue between a liberal intellectual and a communist proletarian, but his advocacy of the middle path⁽⁴²⁾ followed by ordinary people is unconvincing. This is because his liberal intellectual voices ideas which are central to himself, and therefore has the stronger case. There is little doubt where Guéhenno's sympathies lie, when his intellectual says: "Je n'aime pas plus" les révolutionnaires professionnels" que les professeurs de philosophie" (J.R. p.177). and adds that "la recherche de la sagesse est une affaire d'homme seul" (J.R. p.178). Once again, Guéhenno raises the question of intellectual "déracinement" - a fact which is noted by André Rousseaux⁽⁴³⁾ in his article on Journal d'une "Révolution", but this time there is no mistaking the personal nature of the problem:

"Chaque année, en venant ici, je passe à F... avec l'espoir de vérifier que je n'ai pas encore perdu tout contact avec ma race et ma tribu. Mais... un intellectuel est une sorte de heimatlos et c'est n'avoir plus de patrie que d'avoir sa patrie au ciel des idées" (J.R. p.128).

Solitude is the price of intellectual purity⁽⁴⁴⁾ and it is a high price to pay: "le grand péril, c'est de se laisser enfermer en soi, cette triste prison" (J.R. p.148). Nevertheless, although Guéhenno regrets the loneliness inherent in intellectual pursuits, he finds some satisfaction in the admiration which his position inspires in ordinary people: "le pauvre monde est bien bon: il m'admire... Nous lui avons dit avec un air de mystère que nous cherchions la vérité... Je veux bien qu'on m'admire" (J.R. pp.149-150). Such remarks suggest a certain arrogance, but this is not Guéhenno's intention, because he believes that the need for admiration and love is a general human need, which may be satisfied in concrete or abstract terms:

"Être aimé, c'est avoir la certitude qu'il y a au monde quelqu'un... qui t'aimera encore quand toi-même ne pourras plus te supporter ... Dieu, dans les religions, remplace cet office pour toutes les âmes" (J.R. p.103.)

Whereas the ideas concerning intellectual problems do no more than echo L'Évangile éternel and Caliban parle, the condemnation of the militant intellectual marks an important change in attitude. The condemnation is implied rather than stated, because Guéhenno's prime objective is to analyse his own conscience, and this latter point is shrewdly observed by Robert Brasillach: "l'ancien collaborateur de Vendredi ... s'interroge pour savoir s'il a bien agi - c'est un peu

ridicule, un peu comique, un peu triste"⁽⁴⁵⁾. At the same time however, Guéhenno's references to intellectual actions during the Front Populaire make the critical nature of his attitude abundantly clear. Himself a one-time supporter of intellectual involvement in politics, he begins his critique by questioning his own behaviour: "Qu'ai-je fait?... j'ai levé le poing comme tout le monde. J'ai chanté, hurlé parfois comme tout le monde" (J.R. p.38). This in turn leads him to question the entire experience of intellectual support for the Front Populaire:

"Je ne pense pas sans scrupules à ce que fut, ces dernières années, notre action d'intellectuels. Il m'a semblé parfois que nous jouions la "comédie de la révolution"... Pas un de nous qui ne pensât que cette grande parade de la Révolution dont nous étions les acteurs ne fût la Révolution même... Nous tenions des congrès. Nous organisions des meetings... Ce n'était qu'amusant" (J.R. pp. 165-166)

André Rousseaux is therefore correct when in his review of Journal d'une "Révolution", he draws attention to "la distance qui sépare la comédie de la révolution et la révolution vraie qu'il (Guéhenno) a désirée"⁽⁴⁶⁾. A particular target of Guéhenno's criticism is the "meeting", which he dismisses as a forum for personal vanity:

"J'ai vu plus d'une fois jouer la comédie du génie et de l'amour propre, naître des haines mortelles entre des gens de lettres parce que l'un avait été applaudi au moins quarante secondes de plus que l'autre" (J.R. p.165)

In Robert Brasillach's opinion Guéhenno himself is guilty of the vanity which characterised the behaviour of Left-wing intellectuals during the Front Populaire and gives the letter

which Guéhenno wrote to Hitler as an example⁽⁴⁷⁾. Personal misconduct apart, the "meeting" is also condemned by Guéhenno because it abused the good faith of working people, who were encouraged to applaud the intellectuals' actions. He recalls with distaste:

"le moment le plus pénible... des ouvriers de Citroën ou de Renault... défilaient entre la salle et nous. Tous avaient quitté leurs faubourgs pour venir nous assurer de leur fraternelle sympathie dans ce grand combat que nous livrions pour la défense de la liberté et de la civilisation" (J.R. p.168).

Such a frank account of intellectual action obviously delighted a Right-wing critic like Brasillach. He focusses his attention on the fact that Guéhenno "ne nous cache...pas son malaise devant les séances où les délégations ouvrières... venaient féliciter... les intellectuels de leur noble effort"⁽⁴⁸⁾. This is because he looks to Guéhenno for support of his own thesis that the Front Populaire was "une folle aventure"⁽⁴⁹⁾. Obviously the views of a Right-wing critic are biased and misrepresent Guéhenno's ideas to the advantage of the Right. Nevertheless such a possibility must have been foreseen by him. Whilst at Vendredi he attacked Gide for serving the Right-wing cause by publishing Retour de l'U.R.S.S. Consequently Guéhenno's attacks on Left-wing intellectuals can justifiably be seen as evidence of his move away from the Left. He certainly distances himself from his earlier view of the role of the intellectual:

"J'en ai assez d'écrire des articles de journaux, de prononcer des discours de meetings. Assez de parades et de batailles... Je m'accuse de lever et de fermer le poing sans plaisir, sans enthousiasme" (J.R. p.16).

Guéhenno's new attitude is not however without certain important problems. The consequences for his earlier arguments in Caliban parle are particularly serious. Whereas before he could avoid choosing between the liberal intellectual and the communist proletarian by calling for a relevant culture, his attack on "engagement" means that he is left without any options. Nonetheless he proceeds to attack the concept of "engagement" from several directions. His first objection is of a personal nature, since he claims that the experience of political action has bored him. He recalls raising his fist to salute the Spanish republican leader La Pasionaria, but immediately adds: "tout devient routine" (J.R. p.17). Furthermore, Guéhenno believes that he was never really suited to the role of a politically committed intellectual: "J'ai fait semblant de les (les pauvres) plaindre et de m'associer à leur destin" (J.R. p.151). Guéhenno's second major objection to "engagement" is that it infringes upon the freedom of the intellectual and his integrity, so his comments on the "intellectuel engagé" now become tinged with irony as well as with regret: "des intellectuels empéggués, c'est ce qu'il nous arrive aussi quelquefois d'être. Empéggués comme de malheureux oiseaux pris dans la poix" (J.R. p.154). Guéhenno regrets that intellectuals allowed themselves to become pawns in the hands of political parties and he feels that more harm than good was done by "engagement", because the integrity of the intellectual became

compromised through the involvement in politics: "la foule ne retient de nos paroles que ce qui est conforme (aux) slogans (des partis)" (J.R. p.155). In the final analysis however, he rejects "engagement" because he regards it as an impossible goal. The idea that both the intellectual and the worker have the same political aspirations is challenged by Guéhenno, and his conclusion is unequivocal:

"La révolution selon Gide, la révolution selon Malraux... toutes ces fictions romanesques, toutes ces idées libres... qu'avaient - elles de commun avec cette espèce de fermentation fatale que produisent au coeur des masses l'insécurité et le besoin? (J.R. pp.169-170) (50).

The rejection of "engagement" in the 1930s sense is also implicit in the choice of articles for the "Appendices" to Journal d'une Révolution". The decision to select articles which damaged Front Populaire unity in the name of higher moral principles, when they were published in Vendredi, suggest that Guéhenno now envisages a more traditional, apolitical role for the intellectual and is now indifferent to political considerations. This is especially evident in the choice of the article on pacifism, "Au fond de l'absurde. Le pacifisme n'est pas une tactique". Guéhenno himself admits that this article was criticised by the Left, because it was supported by Right-wing writers (51).

With the failure of the Front Populaire and the resulting loss of faith in "engagement", Guéhenno can do no more than express his disillusionment. The hopes of Caliban parle, that intellectual isolation could be overcome by "engagement" have evidently been abandoned. Nonetheless because Guéhenno has a guilt complex about betraying his roots (52), the renunciation of "engagement" must

necessarily lead to a feeling of personal despair. Thierry Maulnier, writing in Action Française about Journal d'une "Révolution" correctly raises this problem when he refers to the "complexe prolétarien" in Guéhenno, and describes his latest work as a journal of personal defeat⁽⁵³⁾. Given the importance of the personal element in Guéhenno's entire thought, it is important to realise that there were subjective as well as objective reasons for his disillusion. His experience of the behaviour of political parties, particularly the P.C.F., throughout the period of his editorship of Europe and Vendredi was at least as important a factor as was the political failure of the Front Populaire. It is therefore no accident that Guéhenno now identifies with André Gide and the difficulties faced by him after the publication of Retour de l'U.R.S.S. He describes Gide as "un homme toujours sincère" (J.R. p.43) and presents him as a victim of communist propaganda: "la propagande communiste a exploité avec une folle imprudence l'adhésion d'André Gide au communisme" (J.R. p.43). Guéhenno now supports Gide's views on the U.S.S.R. and regrets having published letters against him in Vendredi. He accepts as a fact Gide's view of "la médiocrité réglementée de l'époque stalinienne" (J.R. p.4p), so he now claims that "j'ai écrit et publié... deux lettres (contre Gide) sans aucune joie" (J.R. p.85). This confession is noted in André Thérive's review of Journal d'une "Révolution", when the quarrel between Gide and Vendredi is discussed. Thérive believes that it is important that Guéhenno "confesse qu'il faisait un indocile mouton dans le troupeau"⁽⁵⁴⁾. Without doubt the change in attitude towards Gide was in part a result of the fact that Guéhenno was ostracised by former communist friends, in

the wake of his departure from Europe and his articles condemning the Moscow Trials⁽⁵⁵⁾. Certainly the perspective on communism is now totally negative. With communists in mind he states that "la propagande n'est pas la raison!" (J.R. p.182) and he draws an unfavourable comparison between the cult of Stalin and the cult of Hitler: "cela m'attriste que (les ouvriers) jurent par un homme, par Staline, autant que s'ils juraient par Hitler" (J.R. p.179). Finally, with respect to the causes of Guéhenno's despair and disillusion, the effect of killing a child in the motor accident of September 1937 should not be forgotten. Evidence of the depression suffered by him is indeed present throughout the Journal d'une "Révolution". Describing a walk in the country he recalls passing a cemetery, which prompts him to comment: "Je pense sans tristesse au repos, à la paix qui viendra" (J.R. p.57). Later, back in the village, he acknowledges his depression, noting his inability to find the joy of the world and expressing the desire "de (se) perdre dans le néant d'un monde enfin pacifié" J.R. p.123). Just as significantly, when Guéhenno realised that war was inevitable, he withdrew from reality into a rustic existence. He went hunting in order to forget the oncoming war⁽⁵⁶⁾ and avoided all contact with the outside world: "Pendant près d'un mois, j'avais mis tout mon soin à ne pas lire les journaux" (J.R. p.194).

The disillusionment felt by Guéhenno and expressed in Journal d'une "Révolution" is particularly evident if the work is compared to Jeunesse de la France, written during the euphoric period of the Front Populaire in 1935⁽⁵⁷⁾. In Jeunesse de la France he was still favourable to Stalin, whose Russia he saw as a

reflection of Michelet's France, and he still saw the Front Populaire movement as being able to assimilate the hitherto conservative value of France, into the progressive concept of revolution. This earlier work was characterised by an optimism in the future which was so forcefully expounded, that it irritated some critics. Jean Grenier, writing about Jeunesse de la France for La Nouvelle Revue Française in October 1936 noted that the optimism of Guéhenno equalled that of Rousseau, Condorcet and Hugo⁽⁵⁸⁾. José Vincent writing on the same subject in La Croix also questioned the author's naive optimism:

"Oubliant que le véritable homme d'étude souvent et prudemment doute et que le primaire voit, sait, et croit sans broncher... Il (Guéhenno) tombe dans la faiblesse de primaire"⁽⁵⁹⁾.

Guéhenno himself made no apologies for his enthusiasm. In his introduction to Jeunesse de la France he referred to the Front Populaire and to the optimism which it inspired:

"Ces pages rapides n'ont pas d'autre objet que de servir et de promouvoir un esprit de délivrance qui n'a pas cessé d'animer la France pendant presque tout le XIX^e siècle, et qui... semble à l'instant de reprendre son vol" (J.F. pp. 14-15).

Guéhenno's attitude towards the Front Populaire explained his new-found patriotism, which was based on the conviction noted by J.B. Séverac, that France had much to say to the world⁽⁶⁰⁾ and could serve as an example to other nations.

The idea of France as an example to others, which was derived from Michelet, was also the model which inspired Guéhenno's view of Stalin's Russia and hence explained his enthusiasm for it.

Russia was presented in Stalin's words as "l'enfant du prolétariat mondial... la brigade de choc des prolétaires de tous les pays"⁽⁶¹⁾, and parallels were drawn between Stalin's understanding of Russia and Michelet's understanding of France:

"Ce qui m'émeut dans (les) pages de Michelet et dans (les) paroles de Staline, c'est le sens profond qu'elles révèlent chez (les) hommes d'une mission que leur peuple doit accomplir" (J.F. p.33).

Admittedly Guéhenno did temper his enthusiasm for Stalin's Russia with the words:

"Tel est le prestige de la Révolution russe que tous les révolutionnaires du monde sont atteints devant elle d'un complexe d'infériorité. Leur admiration même les paralyse" (J.R. p.29).

Nevertheless, in Jeunesse de la France this was still very much an afterthought. The fact remains that in this book Guéhenno expressed an optimism in the future, which was based on the actual achievements of Russia under Stalin and on the potential for change in France under a Front Populaire government. This being the case Jeunesse de la France was his most politicised work, which in turn explains why when France fell in 1940, the ideas expressed in Guéhenno's book became an embarrassment to the Occupation authorities, and it was therefore banned immediately⁽⁶²⁾.

In Journal d'une "Révolution" Guéhenno's attempt to deal with the loss of faith in "engagement" takes two main forms. Initially the realisation that the opposition between the intellectual and the masses cannot be overcome in the manner outlined in Caliban parle leads him to express his personal

disillusion and despair. This purely negative approach is however complemented by the more positive decision to return to the individualist position of his youth. Individualism was certainly always implicit in his definition of revolution, which is why André Thérive's article on Journal d'une "Révolution" emphasises the fact that for Guéhenno "la transformation de la société serait vaine si celle de l'individu n'était assurée d'abord"⁽⁶³⁾. Nonetheless Guéhenno's individualism now takes on an aggressive form which was previously avoided. He quotes Saint Andrew's statement praising God for the differentiation between individuals:

"parmi tant d'hommes qui ont existé depuis la création du monde... il ne s'en rencontrera pas deux dont les visages offrent une similitude parfaite... sur la plus petite figure, Dieu a placé tous les sens du corps" (J.R. p.33).

Moreover, he adds his own view that the individual is always autonomous and alone: "on s'arrange mieux avec les pierres et avec les arbres qu'avec les hommes" (J.R. p.138). Admittedly Guéhenno also claims that "la vie vraie des hommes est leur vie générale, non leur vie individuelle et privée" (J.R. p.65), but there is no doubt that his individualism is now stronger than at any time since his student days. The new language is immediately apparent to André Thérive, who draws a comparison between Guéhenno and the personalist school: "Jean Guéhenno emprunte parfois un langage très voisin de celui des personnalistes"⁽⁶⁴⁾. Thérive is also struck by the fact that both Guéhenno and the personalists share "(le) culte de la personne humaine"⁽⁶⁵⁾. Thérive's comparison is certainly valid

if the ideas of Emmanuel Mounier, the founder of personalism, are considered. Mounier took up the legacy of Charles Péguy and treated the individual personality as the basis of his reflections, although he also aimed at integration with the social group⁽⁶⁶⁾. These aspects of Mounier's thought are also those of Guéhenno, and the parallels between them go even further. Mounier's anti-capitalism as well as his rejection of bourgeois values⁽⁶⁷⁾, makes the comparison between the two writers especially apt.

In rejecting "engagement" and returning to a frankly individualistic position, Guéhenno moves towards what is ultimately a conservative viewpoint. The patriotic interest in France demonstrated in Jeunesse de la France now leads him to express ideas, which will eventually become compatible with Gaullism and result in his support of De Gaulle's London appeal in June 1940. In the wartime Journal des années noires Guéhenno fully endorses the general's appeal, on the 19th June 1940:

"Hier soir la voix du général de Gaulle à la radio de Londres. Quelle joie d'entendre enfin, dans cet ignoble désastre, une voix un peu fière. "Moi, général de Gaulle, j'invite... La flamme de la résistance française ne peut s'éteindre""
(J.D.A.N. 19 juin 1940, p.15)

In Journal d'une "Révolution" support for De Gaulle is still in the future, but Guéhenno has clearly abandoned his internationalism of the 1920s and early 1930s in favour of a strongly patriotic viewpoint, which is expressed in the conclusion to the book:

"Beau pays, vieux pays, où il n'est pas un homme que je ne puisse toujours comprendre, où il ne se commence pas un rêve que je ne puisse le continuer... espace où s'élargit mon cœur, je t'aime... Mais pays exemplaire, pays de tous les pays le plus humain, tu ne peux pas mourir, tu es promis toujours à la vie la plus noble" (J.R. p.210).

He believes in "une mission de la France" (J.R. p.202) and admires French tradition: "Ce qu'il y a d'admirable dans la tradition française de la révolution, c'est... qu'elle se soit constamment employée à résoudre (les) contradictions (entre la liberté et l'égalité)" (J.R. p.204). Guéhenno's new conservatism makes him justify reward according to merit within the Republic⁽⁶⁸⁾, but it is in the descriptions of the countryside that his conservatism is most evident. A description of a walk in the country, during which he comes across an old bridge, becomes a quest to recapture the past:

"il y a cent cinquante ans que le pont est construit, cent cinquante ans que tous les rousiers de la montagne y arrêtent leur attelage ... Si je m'arrête je pense que c'est afin de faire comme eux... c'est une façon d'entrer dans l'inépuisable passé, de prendre un peu de l'âge de cette terre et des hommes qui l'habitent" (J.R. pp. 56-57).

Even more significantly it is the stability and the unchanging nature of the countryside, which attracts him towards it:

"j'ai devant moi un paysage éternel. Il y a mille ans... ces combes n'étaient pas plus profondes. J'éprouve une vaste et profonde joie à respirer, après tant d'hommes... cette même douceur qui vers le soir descend de la montagne" (J.R. p.59).

Perhaps the clearest indication of Guéhenno's conservatism however, is the attitude towards the gentry displayed in

Journal d'une "Révolution". He recalls the Marquis de Tréogate, whom he met in his parents' café, and is full of indulgence for him:

"(Le marquis de Treógate) ne faisait rien et n'avait jamais rien fait pour essayer seulement (de) sortir (de la misère) - ce qui, selon les principes de notre tribu, était proprement abominable. Mais dans le cas du marquis, ma mère jugeait... (que)... la Providence avait légitimement abrogé la règle... le marquis de Tréogate était de toute évidence né pour ne rien faire" (J.R. p.25).

Furthermore, Guéhenno is thankful to the Marquis:

"Sans doute (lui) dois-je d'avoir connu l'idée qu'il faut des hommes sur la terre qui vivent comme gratuitement et dont la seule fonction soit de l'embellir et de l'anoblir" (J.R. p.26).

Such sympathy for impoverished gentry is even more pronounced with respect to Louise X, whose views on "signing on" Guéhenno quotes in full:

"Si c'est pas malheureux! Nous obliger comme ça à aller tous les matins prendre son rang dans le régiment des pauvres. Mais j'y vais comme une dame, moi... Quelquefois je mets mon chapeau, pour leur apprendre... Je suis une dame après tout" (J.R. pp. 133-134).

As a general rule, Guéhenno proposes the solution presented in Diego Abad de Santillán's El Organismo Económico de la Revolución and he quotes with approval Abad de Santillán's reference to the suggestion of an anarchist friend "qui pousse plus loin encore l'indulgence méprisante (et) propose qu'on fasse à ces parasites d'hier (la classe dirigeante) une rente viagère"⁽⁶⁹⁾. The remarkable leniency advocated by the anarchist theorist Abad de Santillán⁽⁷⁰⁾ stems from the fact that he views brutality as essentially a product of economic privation:

"All periods of privation and penury produce brutality, moral regression and a fierce struggle of all against all for daily bread. Consequently, it is plain that economics influences seriously the spiritual life of the individual and his social relations. That is precisely why we are aiming to establish the best possible economic conditions, which will act as a guarantee of equal and solid relationships among men"(71)

In a post-revolutionary society brutality will be eliminated along with economic privation, so it is possible to envisage sympathetic treatment of the dispossessed aristocracy.

The new conservatism in Guéhenno's thought is complemented by the traditionally conservative nature of his style. A.M. Petitjean draws attention to this dated style and compares Guéhenno's lyricism with that of Chateaubriand and Renan⁽⁷²⁾. Since both authors were a major influence on Guéhenno, this is an apt criticism, but it is Montaigne's Essais which are the real stylistic model for his works from Journal d'un homme de 40 ans to Journal d'une 'Révolution'. Of particular importance here is Montaigne's justification for writing the Essais. Having declared at the outset: "je suis moy-mesmes la matière de mon livre"⁽⁷³⁾, he justifies his decision to write about himself by stating:

"Aumoins j'ay cecy selon la discipline, que jamais homme ne traicta subject qu'il entendit ne cogneust mieux que je fay celui que j'ay entrepris, et qu'en celuy-là je suis le plus sçavant homme qui vive"⁽⁷⁴⁾

Guéhenno like Montaigne, also feels that he can write only about what he knows well and that is himself. The ideal of a universally applicable autobiography rather than autobiography as personal

self-indulgence is the aim of both authors, who moreover now share a conservative perspective in ideas⁽⁷⁵⁾.

Since Journal d'une "Révolution" is a work of transition it is to be expected that its presentation of certain ideas must be confused and contradictory. This is particularly the case with "engagement", which is condemned, but which is also supported in the dialogue between the intellectual and the worker. Nonetheless there is no mistaking Guéhenno's general change in direction. His disillusion with the Front Populaire experience leads him to adopt an apolitical, even conservative standpoint, which takes the form of a return to earlier ideas. Consequently the problem of the intellectual is reassessed in the language of Caliban parle, but more importantly the question of individualism once again becomes the central issue. Guéhenno's presentation of political problems is now once more based predominantly on autobiography, which marks a departure from the approach of Jeunesse de la France and a return to the earlier technique of Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. The change is especially clear in the discussion of revolution, which although an ideal common to all men is nonetheless now presented in terms of the author's autobiography. This individualistic tendency to personalise every problem naturally invites the criticism of Thierry Maulnier: "ce qui frappe le lecteur dans ce livre de M. Guéhenno, ce sont d'abord les constantes références biographiques auxquelles il confronte sa politique"⁽⁷⁶⁾. Ideologically Guéhenno is still pro-socialist, but his socialism is now an idealism based on his personal view of Man, revolution and culture, rather than a political commitment. This is why

André Rousseaux describes him as "tout le contraire d'un homme de parti... il parle le vocabulaire du socialisme international ... mais il le parle mal"⁽⁷⁷⁾.

Finally, Guéhenno's last pre-1940 work and the change in attitude which it represents, invites a comparison between his reaction to "engagement" in the wake of the failure of the Front Populaire and the reaction of Albert Camus during the Cold War. Like Guéhenno, Camus belongs to what Pierre de Boisdeffre terms post-Nietzsche literature, "qui sait que Dieu est mort, et s'efforce de le remplacer par l'Homme"⁽⁷⁸⁾. He is likewise concerned with "la dignité de l'homme"⁽⁷⁹⁾, and in his editorials for Combat "liait... étroitement morale et politique, révolte, et révolution"⁽⁸⁰⁾. When in 1947 the Soviet Labour Camps became an issue which divided Left-wing writers, Camus attacked the making of excuses for the U.S.S.R., treating the problem as a outrage against humanity, deserving the greatest publicity⁽⁸¹⁾. This stance, which echoed Guéhenno's reaction to the pre-war Moscow Trials, led to a major quarrel with Sartre and eventually resulted in Camus withdrawing from political arguments. His final position also parallels that of Guéhenno. The statement in L'homme révolté "je me révolte, donc nous sommes"⁽⁸²⁾, clearly shows that Camus bases all values on personal individual experience - which in his case is that of rebellion⁽⁸³⁾. Furthermore the withdrawal from politics is accompanied by the rejection of radical approaches and a conservative appeal for moderation⁽⁸⁴⁾. The ideological and biographical similarities apart, it is worth speculating about the possible direct influence of Guéhenno on Camus. In Dernières Lumières, derniers plaisirs, he recalls meeting Camus on a lecture

tour in Algeria in 1938, as well as regular subsequent meetings with him⁽⁸⁵⁾. Guéhenno also remembers Camus sending him a copy of La Peste with the dedication "à Jean Guéhenno, son ami, s'il le permet", and makes it clear that

"Je n'avais point de peine à entrer dans sa dialectique et ses problèmes. Ils étaient les miens, ceux d'une certaine espèce, d'une certaine "classe" d'homme entre les écrivains, une classe qui... va disparaître" (D.L.D.P. p.165).

The eighteen months separating the completion of Journal d'une "Révolution" and the outbreak of hostilities with Germany, was a period during which Guéhenno desperately clung to the hope of peace, despite being faced with evidence that such a hope was futile. On the 28th August 1939 he wrote to Jean Blanzat to assure him that war was unlikely: "Je veux vous dire qu'il n'y aura pas de guerre. C'est toute ma raison qui me le dit"⁽⁸⁶⁾. Four days later, with the start of the Polish Campaign, he was still optimistic: "rien n'est encore désespéré. Il n'y aura pas de guerre. Hitler a plus grand intérêt au chantage qu'à la guerre"⁽⁸⁷⁾. Guéhenno's certainty on this matter is evident from his writing a similar letter to Jean Paulhan⁽⁸⁸⁾, but his letter to Blanzat is more important, because it gives his immediate response to the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Guéhenno's words clearly demonstrate his hostility towards Stalin, and his treatment of the Pact as a typical example of Soviet cynicism shows his hostility towards Soviet communism in general:

"Quant à cette histoire Stalinienne, nous avons tort d'être surpris. Je vous ferai relire au commencement d'octobre les pages de Lénine sur le "compromis"... Staline ne fait qu'appliquer la règle... Quelle ordure qu'un tel système!"⁽⁸⁹⁾

In Guéhenno's case news of the Pact confirmed rather than changed his earlier opinions, although it did lead to some extreme conclusions. Writing to Blanzat on the 27th September 1939, he blamed Stalin for the outbreak of war: "le vrai maître de cet ignoble jeu me paraît être Staline, bien plus que Hitler"⁽⁹⁰⁾.

For as long as armed conflict remained a real possibility, Guéhenno maintained his public promise made in Journal d'une "Révolution"⁽⁹¹⁾, not to publish in the event of war. On the 30th September 1939 he mentioned this in a letter to Blanzat:

"vous savez bien ce que je me suis promis à moi-même, si la guerre advenait. J'écirai pour moi mais ne publierai rien"⁽⁹²⁾.

In this letter Guéhenno also admits being tempted "par le désir d'être associé... à ce qui est pour le moment l'action commune"⁽⁹³⁾.

Nevertheless his final decision was to continue as a teacher⁽⁹⁴⁾

and he accepted the move of his Lycée to Clermont Ferrand in October 1939⁽⁹⁵⁾, even though he resented leaving Paris⁽⁹⁶⁾.

On arrival in Clermont-Ferrand for the start of the autumn term, Guéhenno took rooms at Mme. Oudin's at 14 rue Dolly, in Chamalières, a village situated close to the town⁽⁹⁷⁾. With the threat of

armed conflict receding, he soon reviewed his position on war and forgot his earlier promises to keep his silence. Arguing that the "phoney war" was not really war, Guéhenno wrote to Blanzat in

October 1939 to restate the optimism that was momentarily shattered in September: "mon espoir est toujours que la guerre à proprement parler, le combat entre Rhin et Moselle ne se développera pas"⁽⁹⁸⁾.

By this statement he released himself from his promise of silence and involved himself once again in public affairs. Whereas on the

29th September Guéhenno was still opposed to Paulhan's suggestion of a public appeal for Jean Giono⁽⁹⁹⁾, who had been arrested for spreading defeatist attitudes⁽¹⁰⁰⁾, by the 9th October he was expressing his pity for Giono and support for Gide's efforts to liberate him⁽¹⁰¹⁾.

Shortly afterwards, in December 1939, Guéhenno received an offer from Marianne to take over the "Chronique littéraire hebdomadaire", which was to involve analysing "l'esprit de la France... à travers l'activité de ses écrivains et ses penseurs, les plus représentatifs"⁽¹⁰²⁾. This opportunity to revive Europe's "Notes de lecture" caught his imagination, but he was fearful of the possible political interpretations of such a project. This is why he wrote to Blanzat: "je crains que les circonstances ne suffisent et en dépit de moi-même, à donner à tout ce que j'écris un accent nationaliste"⁽¹⁰³⁾. The danger of repeating the mistake for which he condemned the 1914 generation of writers is one which haunted Guéhenno and it accounts for his letter to Paulham, asking his advice on whether to accept Marianne's offer⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. Encouraged by Blanzat⁽¹⁰⁵⁾, Guéhenno eventually decided in favour of the "Chronique littéraire hebdomadaire". This was a difficult decision, but what influenced Guéhenno was the fact that Marianne's editor, Emmanuel Berl, had been a close friend of his since the days of Halévy's salon in the 1920s. Furthermore, being a pacifist and a supporter of the Munich Accords as well as of the government, Berl could be relied upon to support the efforts to secure peace in spite of the difficult circumstances of the Phoney War. Shortly after accepting the Marianne offer, Guéhenno extended his public

voice to the radio network. In January 1940 he informed Blanzat about the commencement of a series of literary talks, whose first subjects were Bérénice and Phèdre⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. Nevertheless when only the second of his articles for Marianne entitled "Entre deux mondes"⁽¹⁰⁷⁾, was subjected to state censorship⁽¹⁰⁸⁾, Guéhenno became uneasy about publishing and his original fears about repeating the mistake made by writers in 1941, returned. As a result he sought reassurance from Blanzat⁽¹⁰⁹⁾, as well as approval from Paulhan⁽¹¹⁰⁾. Although Guéhenno maintained his links with Marianne until the Armistice of June 1940 - at which time he was asked to write a major article on the political situation⁽¹¹¹⁾, he became increasingly sceptical about the advisability of this association. The immediate cause of this scepticism was the suppression of a key paragraph in one of his articles⁽¹¹²⁾, but already in February 1940 he was suffering from a serious psychosomatic disorder which he described to Blanzat as "une crise de fatigue et de désespoir"⁽¹¹³⁾. Two relapses followed⁽¹¹⁴⁾, but in the intervening periods Guéhenno began work on a book which in the contemporary situation was destined for the drawer⁽¹¹⁵⁾. Changer la vie, "(un) récit dans le genre de Journal d'un homme de 40 ans"⁽¹¹⁶⁾, prefigured his work during the Occupation, which was likewise left unpublished. As far as Guéhenno's public voice was concerned, this fell silent with the beginning of the Occupation. With the exception of a short extract of Journal des années noires, entitled Dans la prison, which he published in the clandestine Éditions de Minuit under the pseudonym Cévennes⁽¹¹⁷⁾, his name disappeared from public view. He refused an offer to appear on

Radio Paris in June 1941⁽¹¹⁸⁾ and an offer from the Gestapo to become editor of a socialist newspaper⁽¹¹⁹⁾, preferring instead the lower profile of a Lycée teacher⁽¹²⁰⁾. Consequently it was with some pride that Guéhenno was able to claim in La Part de la France, that he fulfilled his pledge not to publish in war: "Tant que dura l'occupation, j'estimai ne pas devoir publier ouvertement une seule ligne" (L.P.D.F. p.11).

As well as summarising most of Guéhenno's preoccupations of the inter-war years, the newly acquired conservatism of Journal d'une "Révolution" also looks forward to his prodigious literary output in the years 1945-1977, when he wrote a large number of essays and autobiographies, of which the most important are: Journal des années noires and Jean-Jacques - both written during the Occupation, Voyages, La Foi difficile, Sur le chemin des hommes, Changer la vie, Ce que je crois, La Mort des autres, Caliban et Prospéro, Carnets du vieil écrivain and Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs.

When Guéhenno's Occupation work appeared in print in the late 1940s, it was immediately apparent that the war and the Occupation had done little to change his ideas, although in the post-war preface to Journal des années noires he casts doubt on the continuing validity of his earlier pacifism: "J'avais trop raison en juin 1940 de craindre que la servitude ne fût pour les jeunes gens une plus grande épreuve encore que la guerre" (J.D.A.N. Préface p.13). Nevertheless the evidence of Journal des années noires itself leaves little doubt that he regarded armed resistance as wasteful and unnecessary. In January 1942

Guéhenno notes "la défaite de l'Allemagne est... certaine... Il ne faut plus qu'attendre" (J.D.A.N. 24 janvier 1942 p.232). Later, in August 1944 he continues to endorse this viewpoint when he refers to the opinion of his friend B...:

"Tous ces combats dans Paris, pour se donner l'illusion qu'on ne doit qu'à soi-même sa liberté, quand il est si clair que c'est aux autres que nous la devons... lui semblent vains... un gaspillage de la vie... (Mais) la vie d'une idée, de la liberté - ne peut être la même dans les masses et dans les cervelles critiques comme celles de mon ami B... ou la mienne" (J.D.A.N. 23 août 1944 p.436).

In general terms the war years served to reinforce rather than weaken Guéhenno's earlier opinions. In June 1941 he expressed his apprehension at the prospect of a Soviet victory over Nazi Germany: "Si le communisme parvient seulement à résister à Hitler, il a bien de chances de gagner toute l'Europe" (J.D.A.N. 23 juin 1941, p.156). More importantly however, the return to a frankly individualist viewpoint begun in Journal d'une "Révolution", now becomes even more prominent:

"Ni la cause de l'Allemagne, ni la cause de l'Angleterre, ni la cause de la Russie n'est profondément la mienne. Ne pas se laisser détruire par les propagandes, envahir par la "société". Revenir à des idées simples, à l'unique problème: comment un homme se fait, comment un homme devient plus homme" (J.D.A.N. 8 décembre 1940. p.76).

The same preoccupation with self-sufficiency and the pursuit of purely personal goals is also present in Jean-Jacques - the biography of Rousseau which Guéhenno wrote during the Occupation and published in the years 1948-1952. Here Rousseau is presented as a lonely but self-sufficient man, who, like the author, seeks

to perfect himself⁽¹²¹⁾. Although in Jean-Jacques Guéhenno restates his inter-war "core" argument that all individuals are similar, hence: "Penser à soi c'est en dépit de tout... penser à tous les autres" (J.J. Part 2, p.292)⁽¹²²⁾, he is now less concerned with social cohesion and emphasises that revolution is a purely personal process. The definition of revolution as a need for truth⁽¹²³⁾, leaves little doubt on this matter, because truth can only be attained by a personal effort of sincerity.

The slight elaboration on the inter-war definition of revolution as a process of spiritual self-improvement, which Guéhenno makes in Jean-Jacques, was already implicit in Caliban parle, because there he made it clear that culture and revolution were synonymous. His post 1945 work is therefore largely a restatement of earlier ideas. Voyages, of 1952, the first book dealing with his post-war life, is in this respect a model for his later work. Despite the difficult last years of his relationship with Romain Rolland, Guéhenno once more hails him as a hero and refers to the "incroyable chance que ce fut de vivre quelquefois assez près de lui" (V. p.88). Equally importantly he is still very interested in Michelet, which is why he is grateful to Nobel prize winner Gabriela Mistral, for writing an article publicising his lectures in Rio de Janeiro, where she hailed him as Michelet's spiritual son⁽¹²⁴⁾. There is certainly no change in Guéhenno's attitude to colonialism. In the second part of the book, whilst retracing the footsteps of André Gide in French Africa, he notes the progress that has been made⁽¹²⁵⁾, so despite condemning the abuses of some colonial administrators⁽¹²⁶⁾, he feels that French presence in Africa is justified⁽¹²⁷⁾ and is happy to justify French rule to the natives: "Je suis sûr de leur

avoir... fait comprendre pourquoi nous sommes ici"(V. p.193).

Part of the explanation for the constancy in Guéhenno's life-long concerns is to be found in the fact that after 1945 he remained in the teaching profession, although now in a supervisory capacity as an Inspecteur général de l'Education Nationale (Lettres)⁽¹²⁸⁾. His essay on education, the Sur le chemin des hommes of 1959, contains no new thoughts on the role of the teacher, but is instead a restatement of Guéhenno's general inter-war ideas. He still believes that rather than be fitted into society, an individual should seek personal fulfilment⁽¹²⁹⁾. Furthermore he views education as a bridge between the poets and the masses, which should serve to increase the lucidity and consciousness of the nation⁽¹³⁰⁾. Finally, returning to the inter-war problems of the teacher's role as a guardian of culture and the relationship between teachers and the state, Guéhenno again condemns the irresponsible use of eloquence⁽¹³¹⁾ as well as the model of a teacher as a representative of the government⁽¹³²⁾. Unlike his view of education, his inter-war assessment of the First World War is not repeated with the same degree of conviction. In La Mort des autres of 1968 Guéhenno rejects the argument put forward in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, that the masses were forced to fight for a bourgeois cause, and admits that: "Il est vrai, dans ces premières semaines d'août, des peuples entiers étaient tombés à une sorte d'inconscience... Ils étaient redevenus des hordes dénuées de toute raison" (L.M.D.A. p.94). Nonetheless his basic opposition to the 1914 conflict remains unshaken. He states that "ce cinquantenaire ne peut être que la commémoration de la sottise

et du crime" (L.M.D.A. p.12) and adds: "Je ne cesse de crier non à tout ce que nous avons fait, accablé par le sentiment de l'horreur la plus inutile" (L.M.D.A. pp. 154-155).

The backward-looking nature of Guéhenno's post-1945 work has the effect of making him a defender of tradition and therefore a conservative critic of change. Nowhere is this more evident than in the collection of essays entitled Caliban et Prospero, which he published in 1969. The preface to the most important of the essays - which gives the collection its title is Guéhenno's response to the events of May 1968. What is immediately apparent is that the author is making a conscious effort to interpret the events using the categories as well as the language of Caliban parle and that this attempt is anachronistic as well as confusing. Guéhenno cannot understand the Sorbonne occupation:

"Si la Sorbonne a été "occupée", ce n'est pas du fait de Caliban. Il n'y a rien gagné. Cette occupation désordonnée et ces bavardages irresponsables ont seulement parodié ses rêves" (C. & P. p.17).

This view does not however prevent him from attempting an analysis of the situation in terms of the Caliban-Prospero dichotomy:

"C'était Caliban peut-être qui curieusement se révoltait dans tous ceux qu'on pouvait penser être des disciples de Prospero, et Prospero peut-être, en leur personne, par un généreux délire, tentait de se faire Caliban" (C. & P. p.11).

Ultimately Guéhenno is only prepared to support the student unrest of May 1968 if "ce tumulte... (fait) la preuve que les jeunes gens en sort au point de ne pas vouloir seulement consommer et être consommés" (C. & P. p.15). This in turn illustrates the degree to which he is out of step with contemporary society. Faced with

the increasing rejection of his personal ideals by the world around him, Guéhenno does not attempt to modify his views, but instead launches an attack on the modern consumer society in the essay "Caliban et Prospero". He regrets the reduction of everything to the role of commodities: "Prospero n'est plus dans sa tour d'ivoire, ni Caliban dans sa caverne. Presque tous les arts sont en train de devenir *mécaniques*" (C. & P. p.48). Moreover, without wishing to denigrate technological progress, Guéhenno fears the consequences of the consumer life-style: "C'est... comme le consommateur... de cette civilisation mécanique que l'homme moderne est en péril" (C. & P. p.51). This is because "l'abondance vulgaire que créent les techniques peut détruire insidieusement l'esprit des hommes, l'emprisonner dans des conformismes imbéciles" (C. & P. p.52). Guéhenno acknowledges the increase in wealth of post-1945 society, but this is ultimately irrelevant to him: "La révolution scientifique et technique crée l'abondance... Mais la vraie révolution concerne les hommes, les personnes, leur vie intérieure, leur bonheur et leur dignité" (C. & P. p.14). He remains committed to the view of revolution and culture outlined in Caliban parle and this is why "Caliban et Prospero" is an unequivocal restatement of those views:

"J'étais (en 1928) dans la conviction passionnée que les lumières de Prospero devaient devenir les lumières de Caliban et changer enfin sa vie, si le monde devait trouver son ordre. C'est ainsi que je n'ai guère cessé de me définir, peut-être naïvement, la Révolution" (C. & P. p.31)

The evidence of Guéhenno's post-1945 essays suggests that after Journal d'une "Révolution", his thought underwent only

minimal changes, but the real justification for the argument that his ideas remain fixed after 1939 is provided by his post-war autobiographies. Even the briefest analysis of these works reveals that they continue the style, the themes and even deal with the same part of Guéhenno's life, as did such works as Journal d'un homme de 40 ans and Journal d'une "Révolution".

In his first major post-1945 autobiography, La Foi difficile of 1957, Guéhenno actually states at the outset that his aim is to write another Journal d'un homme de 40 ans - that is a journal of "un homme de série"⁽¹³³⁾. He again attempts to reconcile the desire for social intercourse with the need to preserve personal freedom, and more particularly he re-examines the problem of "déclassement", which is such a major issue in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. Guéhenno claims that being an intellectual, he was too educated and sceptical to commit himself to an ideal, hence he believes he would have been happier as well as more socially useful, if he had stayed in the factory and become a "militant syndicaliste"⁽¹³⁴⁾. With respect to more general issues, Guéhenno again declares that for him "la Révolution... n'était... qu'une pensée" (F.D. p.158) and he attacks communism, condemning its violence as well as the "atmosphère d'église" which he finds in the P.C.F.⁽¹³⁵⁾. He is now quite clearly opposed to the basic idea of intellectual commitment. He is scathing about inter-war "engagement", emphasising that he no longer signs any public declarations⁽¹³⁶⁾ and he dismisses his role in the clandestine Les Lettres Françaises during the Occupation. He feels that the results obtained were minimal, although the risks were great, but

more importantly he notes that the resistance organisation of which he was a member - the Comité National des Écrivains (C.N.E.), attracted most of its members after the Liberation⁽¹³⁷⁾.

Guéhenno's most detailed autobiography, which was published under the title Changer la vie in 1961 but written during the Occupation⁽¹³⁸⁾ is a re-working of the period covered in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. Yet again he wishes the book to be read "comme l'histoire de n'importe qui" (C.V. p.14), but this does not make it any less self-indulgent. Guéhenno himself admits that his reason for going back to the memories of his childhood poverty is "pour m'en débarrasser" (C.V. p.79). Unlike Journal d'un homme de 40 ans however, Changer la vie is a much more straightforward autobiography, containing many more details and manifesting a greater personal honesty. Guéhenno discusses the relatively comfortable period of his life when his mother ran a café in detail⁽¹³⁹⁾ and he also gives the true reasons for his presence in the shoe factory⁽¹⁴⁰⁾. Whereas in Journal d'un homme de 40 ans Guéhenno fictionalised the account of his early life because he wished to claim exclusively working-class origins, as well as write a general account of a poor childhood, in Changer la vie he is willing to present the truth about his early life. Nonetheless he still feels uncomfortable writing a purely personal book and this is why he justifies his use of the first person narrative at considerable length:

""Je" est toujours une très petite personne trop intéressée et qui se prend trop au sérieux.
"Je" devrait n'intervenir que comme un témoin, non comme un polémiste hargneux et offensé qui juge le monde... Je voudrais servir la vérité, non pas ma vérité. Mettons que ce "je" est toutes mes racines, un moyen de ne pas quitter le réel. Mais je voudrais bien que ce réel ne fût pas mesquin" (C.V. pp.14-15).

Whereas in Changer la vie Guéhenno gives his definitive account of the factual experiences of his early life, in Ce que je crois of 1964 he gives an intellectual autobiography. In this work he justifies his life-long need to rewrite his early autobiography, by claiming that this period of his life was always a source of strength to him:

"Chaque fois que l'à-quoi-bon m'a tenté, je n'ai eu qu'à retourner aux souvenirs de mon enfance comme à la source de ma force, et toujours ils m'ont remis à l'ouvrage"
(C.Q.J.C. p.65).

Guéhenno accepts that intellectually he is still very much the man he was at the start of his literary career: "j'en suis toujours à ce que j'entrevis vers ma trentième année" (C.Q.J.C. p.59). Consequently Ce que je crois is a restatement of very familiar ideas. Guéhenno emphasises the importance of personal freedom and the power of the human will⁽¹⁴¹⁾. He also states that although "Il se peut que j'aie attribué à cette révolution tout intellectuelle que chacun peut accomplir en soi une importance excessive... voilà bien ce qu'est ma foi" (C.Q.J.C. p.106). At the same time the "core" argument which he first found in Michelet and which enabled him to claim that social cohesion was possible is once again put forward:

"C'est une chose obscure que la fraternité... telle circonstance inattendue nous rappelle soudain la condition commune et nous voilà envahis d'une vague tendresse et d'un vague effroi" (C.Q.J.C. pp.114-115).

In his penultimate work, Carnets du vieil écrivain, Guéhenno develops the theme of the constancy of his ideas. The realisation of Ce que je crois that he had not changed since 1930, enables him to argue that in Caliban parle he anticipated the problems of his whole life⁽¹⁴²⁾. This in turn means that he consciously presents himself as a defender of declining traditions:

"Ma foi d'autrefois reste entière... Dans le délabrement d'aujourd'hui, dans l'incertitude et la mollesse des pensées, je me dis quelquefois qu'il n'y a que les vieux qui tiennent. Les jeunes sont dans la confusion... snobs infantiles de la modernité" (C.D.V.E. p.172).

This being the case, at the end of his life Guéhenno returns to the preoccupations of his youth and gives the reader a book which is full of the ideas which were already familiar to his public in the inter-war years: "décidément vieux... je suis revenu à l'esprit de Michelet, sûr que c'est quand j'étais jeune que j'étais le plus près de la vérité" (C.D.V.E. p.172). No longer a part of any literary grouping after 1945, Guéhenno accepts his loneliness⁽¹⁴³⁾ and the fact that "Le vieil écrivain se sent démodé et comme chassé du monde" (C.D.V.E. p.177). Nonetheless he remains defiant in the face of the world's indifference to him: "je ferai l'éloge du démodé. La mode est de dire du mal du langage. Je crois aux mots, à la puissance des mots" (C.D.V.E. p.177). In his final work, Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs of 1977, Guéhenno repeats in the first few pages his acceptance of the fact that he no longer has a place in the modern world:

"j'espérais changer le monde. Il me semble quelquefois maintenant en être chassé. Il change, mais je ne me sens guère associé à ce changement et je ne vois plus bien où j'y ai ma place" (D.L.D.P. p.9).

He feels out of place in post-1945 society and realises that he has nothing of relevance left to say: "je suis sûrement, dans ce monde plein de bruit et de fureur tout à fait démodé. Il n'importe" (D.L.D.P. p.206).

It is somewhat ironic that a man who at the outset of his career called on writers and intellectuals to make their work relevant to the masses, should have ended his life knowing that he had become irrelevant to the modern world. Nevertheless it is clear that the process which led to this situation developed over many years and can be traced back to the rejection of "engagement" in Journal d'une "Révolution". After that time Guéhenno's literary production consisted almost entirely of re-workings of the ideas as well as the autobiographies, which he had already set out on paper. Consciously refusing to accept the values of post-1945 society, which he saw as a threat to his long held ideals, Guéhenno had little to say to the post-1945 world and moreover when he did consider contemporary issues such as the events of May 1968, what he had to say was negative. Although he himself felt pride at having remained faithful to the ideas of his youth, this fidelity had the effect of making him a conservative defender of traditions. It is therefore not surprising that in 1961 he was elected to the Académie Française⁽¹⁴⁴⁾,

an election which was unthinkable in the inter-war years⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. Despite publishing a large body of work after 1945, its backward looking nature meant that Guéhenno never regained the influence which he had in the inter-war years. After 1945 he became an officially respected but generally neglected figure, who persevered in his obsession with the figures of the past. It is perhaps fitting that Guéhenno's last public act was an impassioned speech made on the subject of "Voltaire et la liberté, Rousseau, et la justice", on the occasion of an international conference held in Paris in the 4th July 1978 to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the death of these two writers. Struck down by a "crise d'hémiplégie" while still in the conference hall, he was taken to hospital, but despite making a temporary recovery he died soon afterwards on the 22nd September 1978. His ashes were scattered in the sea off the coast of Brittany, because this was his wish expressed to his wife only a few months earlier: "au fond, c'est là que je voudrais être"⁽¹⁴⁶⁾.

Because it is clear that Guéhenno's post-1939 career was characterised by a decline in his popular appeal and an increasing isolation within society, it is obvious that his importance has to be judged on the basis of his role in the inter-war years. There seems little doubt that at this time Guéhenno was an important figure, since he not only published several important essays, but also shaped public opinion through his editorials and the editorial decisions which he took on behalf of Europe and Vendredi. Furthermore he was involved in some way with many

of the public manifestations of intellectual concern for political and social questions throughout the 1930s.

Nevertheless the question arises to what extent was Guéhenno a representative figure, that is to say can he truly be regarded as representing the ideas and difficulties of the group of "intellectuels engagés" outlined by Herbert R. Lottman? With respect to his major books published between 1927 and 1939 there is no doubt that, with his friends Dabit, Guilloux and Nizan, Guéhenno helped create a new genre in the literary presentation of the working classes, which was based on autobiographical experience. This new approach was a departure from the earlier naturalistic treatment of the subject, but more importantly it enabled the authors to raise the wider problems of intellectuality, class and culture. This can be seen in the work of Berl as well as in that of Nizan and it is particularly evident in the work of Guéhenno. Ramon Fernandez was correct when he presented Guéhenno's essential problem as that of a "Caliban cultivé", because in Guéhenno's case culture was an area where he sought to resolve his personal conflict of intellectuality and class. Considered to be a bourgeois by his mother, Guéhenno could not accept his "déclassement" because from the beginning, at the Collège de Fougères, he was also rejected by his new bourgeois peers, who regarded him as an unwelcome intruder. When he finally found acceptance in Halévy's salon it was too late for him to feel at ease in bourgeois circles or to adopt a bourgeois political ideology. Being rejected by both his former as well as his contemporary social peers, Guéhenno experienced

intense guilt over his "déclassement" and this in turn explained his political choices. He decided to become a Left-wing sympathiser of the working classes, but this was above all an expression of a desire for fidelity to a childhood memory. Consequently Guéhenno's socialism was firmly rooted in the pre-1914 Jaurèsian ideal and he had little real understanding of the problems affecting the contemporary worker. The desire to come to terms with his personal guilt over his "déclassement" also led Guéhenno to consider the class bias of culture. In the majority of his published works, but especially in Caliban parle he therefore presented the dominant bourgeois culture as a poison which served to detach him from his ancestors. More importantly however, he also called for the cultural elite to make their work more relevant to the masses, thereby offering a solution which would bridge the gap between intellectual and worker. What was essentially a solution to the personal problem of déclassement was however presented by Guéhenno as a general model for the whole cultural elite throughout the inter-war years. It was moreover one of his most influential ideas, because the concept of a culture relevant to the masses anticipated the later calls of the "intellectuels engagés" in the 1930s. In as far as it raised the question of the class bias of culture, Guéhenno's early work was undoubtedly a significant contribution to the development of the phenomenon of inter-war intellectual "engagement",

The concern with culture was only one instance where Guéhenno exemplified the problems of the "intellectuels engagés", because he was equally vociferous in his opposition to war. Once again

Guéhenno's reasons for raising this problem were originally private in nature, since he could not come to terms with his experiences in the trenches of the First World War. As a result the expression of outrage at the events of 1914-1918 formed a major part of his inter-war work. The personal element in Guéhenno's pacifism explains why he never formulated a coherent pacifist doctrine, being unable to take a dispassionate view of the subject, but it is important to realise that he was always willing to aid the collective effort to prevent war and preserve peace. This willingness to take part in collective action was ironically born of Guéhenno's experiences in the trenches. It was there that he realised that individual human beings shared a common destiny and could therefore collaborate in securing common goals. As well as a solution to the problems of "déclassement" and culture, intellectual "déclassement" can therefore also be seen as a reaction to the experiences of the trenches and an expression of the new-found faith in the potential of collective action.

The third major case where Guéhenno's inter-war work reflects the concerns of the "intellectuels engagés" is in the call for social justice. Clearly in Guéhenno's case this can be traced back to the influence of his father, but it is primarily an issue which makes it necessary to consider the period of the "intellectuels engagé's" greatest influence - the Front Populaire. This was a period when Guéhenno was wholeheartedly committed to the idea of intellectual involvement in the struggle for a better society and when he rose to a position of authority on the Left, becoming co-director of Vendredi, the weekly paper of the Front Populaire.

During the early part of the Front Populaire period, Guéhenno played the role of a Left-wing activist rather than of an intellectual or writer, speaking at election meetings, sitting on the praesidium of the Congrès International des Écrivains pour la défense de la culture and generally doing his best to realise Michelet's ideal of "moi-humanité", by aspiring to the role of a political leader. Seeing the Front Populaire as a movement which could bring about social justice in France without recourse to violence, Guéhenno gave it his full support and served the alliance by writing frequent articles, as well as by giving his services as co-director of Vendredi free of charge.

Nevertheless as well as constituting the high point of "engagement" the experience of the Front Populaire and Vendredi also demonstrated to Guéhenno the dangers of intellectual involvement in a political struggle. After an initial period of excitement, to which Jeunesse de la France bears witness, he became increasingly disillusioned and in this respect Guéhenno's case posed the general problem of fellow-travelling. This fellow-traveller's constant obligation to choose between high ideals and political expediency was one which he could not long endure, particularly since he believed that the generous idealistic impulses of intellectuals who served the Front Populaire were being cynically exploited by the political parties which made up the alliance. Consequently Guéhenno's attitude throughout the period of his involvement with Vendredi was to disregard political considerations and remain faithful to his idealistic view of the Front Populaire, as well as to his general moral principles. In the years 1935-1938 he

showed himself to be a liberal idealist who was not afraid to speak out publically in defence of civil rights, even at the risk of being condemned for damaging the Left politically. This liberalism brought to the fore a long-standing constant in Guéhenno's personality and his literary output, which was his basic individualism. There seems little doubt that this individualism can be traced back to his childhood, when his attempt to improve himself through education obliged him to be self-reliant and follow his father's example, which showed that a better life can be secured by personal rather than collective effort. The result of this early awareness of the importance of individual effort was Guéhenno's life-long definition of revolution as a process of individual self-improvement rather than as a violent change in the political and social structure of society. Such a definition of revolution reflected in Guéhenno's constant public accounts of his ideas, demonstrated the liberal traditions as well as the aspirations of the "intellectuels engagés", but it also brought him into conflict with the political realities of the Front Populaire and more particularly with the Communist Party. A liberal fellow-traveller like so many of the "intellectuels engagés", Guéhenno's difficulties during 1937-1938 were of general importance to the whole of this group, because they illustrated the practical impossibility of maintaining a liberal, progressive but non-communist attitude and hence of being a non-communist "intellectuel engagé". As a liberal, Guéhenno had to attack communist abuses of individual civil liberties, such as the show trials held in Moscow in 1936-1937. In condemning this gross abuse of justice he expressed the

disquiet of many fellow-travellers, but the importance of Guéhenno lies in the fact that he stated publically what many intellectuals preferred to agonise over in private, thereby precipitating the destruction of the unity of the Front Populaire and of the group of "intellectuels engagés". Notwithstanding his opposition to the Moscow Trials Guéhenno also challenged the communist call for intervention in Spain and presented the U.S.A. instead of the U.S.S.R. as a model society which he wanted to see reproduced in France. His anti-communist and anti-Soviet attitude of the late 1930s was in a sense prefigured by his earlier criticisms of Bolshevik attitudes to culture and the abandonment of the biography of Lenin, but his public statements in the newspaper of the Front Populaire were especially damaging to the alliance of the Left in which the communists played a major role. Furthermore these statements also served to force Guéhenno into an ever more conservative position.

Guéhenno's statements of the period 1936-1938, when he increasingly played the role of a conservative defender of French values as well as a critic of communism, inevitably raise the question of to what extent was he always conservative? His style throughout his career was certainly traditional and old-fashioned, but although in the case of a non-fiction writer innovation is always difficult, in Guéhenno's case this conservatism of style is significant because it reflects similar qualities in his thought. His idealistic socialism was backward-looking and expressed the preoccupations of the pre-1914 period, since it was above all an expression of fidelity to a childhood memory. This again poses the question of

intellectuality and class, but this backward-looking tendency in Guéhenno's ideas goes beyond an emotional preference for recollections of turn of the century working-class life. This is because his ideological roots lay in the works of French figures who were precursors of socialism rather than socialists in any modern sense. Rousseau and Michelet were his principal heroes and although Jaurès was a more modern leader whom Guéhenno greatly admired, even he belonged to the pre-1914 world. Michelet was undoubtedly the greatest single influence on Guéhenno's philosophical as well as his political development. The idea of a common "core" shared by all individuals, the idea of a contractual society, the idea of the divorce between culture and the masses as well as the conception of the writer as "moi-humanité", were all derived from Michelet, becoming integral aspects of Guéhenno's thought.

Nevertheless, although there was a certain pre-disposition towards conservatism and tradition in Guéhenno from the outset of his public career, the principal factor which led to his transformation into a conservative figure was the realisation at the end of the Front Populaire period, that the solution to the problem of culture outlined in Caliban parle, was no longer tenable. The failure of "engagement" which he chronicled in Journal d'une "Révolution", obliged him to acknowledge the unreality of his call for a relevant culture and to conclude that the interests of the intellectual and of the masses were irreconcilable, although this was a reluctant conclusion, undermined later by some of the statements made in the post-1945 period. Since it was impossible to overcome the conflict between

Caliban and Prospero, Guéhenno was logically obliged to make a choice: it being unrealistic for him to return to his family's social origins by going to work in a factory, his only other option was to accept the traditional, conservative role of an intellectual, represented by the figure of Prospero. After 1945 Guéhenno became an author much favoured by the bourgeoisie. Professor Max Milner, a student of his at the Lycée Henri IV in 1942-1942, takes the view that Guéhenno the former revolutionary, became a man of tradition after 1945⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. Of particular importance in this development were the regular articles Guéhenno wrote for Le Figaro in the years 1944-1977 and for Le Monde in 1977-1978. Politically neutral, these articles concentrated on contemporary issues, but related them to the timeless questions of culture and civilisation. With respect to more substantial works Ce que je crois of 1965 is the frankest endorsement by the author of the traditional role of a liberal intellectual. Guéhenno makes no attempt to obscure the fact that his primary concern is the individual self and he therefore emphasises the personal rather than the social aspects of his belief.

Guéhenno's ultimate transformation in the eyes of the public from a revolutionary idealist to a self-involved man of tradition, cost him his place as an influential figure in public life and as a result his role in the inter-war years has largely been forgotten. Nonetheless in the years 1927-1940 Guéhenno played a very major role which deserves to be recognised because it was representative of the "intellectuels engagés" as a whole. Since he was always willing to publically state the problems of the group, his career reveals the

reasons for which these inter-war intellectuals endorsed the concept of "engagement" and why eventually the group fragmented, when the individual members rejected the objectives of "engagement" as well as the concept itself.

Footnotes to Chapter Seven

1. See: Letter from Jean Guéhenno to Romain Rolland of the 16th December 1934 in Cahiers Romain Rolland, Cahier 23, p.323.
2. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 24th April 1937, Guéhenno states that he is working "sur un petit livre cet hiver". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
3. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 22nd September 1937, Guéhenno writes: Je viens de passer de noires semaines. Un enfant à bicyclette est venu se jeter contre ma voiture et s'est tué". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
4. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of early 1938, Guéhenno informs his friend that he is working on a book. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
5. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 31st December 1938, Guéhenno writes: "j'ai porté hier la dernière partie du livre..." (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
6. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 23rd August 1938, Guéhenno writes: "j'ai presque des regrets de vous avoir parlé de ce Journal des vacances. Je pense maintenant qu'il est bon à mettre dans un tiroir". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). Moreover in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 5th September 1938, Guéhenno writes: "j'ai un peu peur que cela (le Journal) ne vaille rien". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

7. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 31st December 1938, Guehenno writes "je serais content s'il vous était possible de publier des fragments (du Journal)". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
8. Pages 15-41 and 128-139 of Journal d'une "Révolution" were published as "Journal des vacances 1937-1938" in La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome L11, 1 mars 1939, pp. 393-405 and as "Journal des vacances 1937-1938", in tome L11, 1 avril 1939, pp. 599-609.
9. Since most of the critical reviews of Journal d'une "Révolution" appeared in May and June 1939, it can be assumed that the work was published at about this time.
10. See: J.R. p.7.
11. See: *ibid.*, p.114. Guéhenno asks himself: "N'ai-je pas... pensé à la révolution comme à une sorte de religion? J'ai espéré la révolution comme on espère un nouveau dieu".
12. See for example: J.R. pp. 18-29.
13. See: *ibid.*, p.117, where Guéhenno emphasises that revolution is a spiritual process when he states: "la révolution est d'abord une chose morale". See also: *ibid.*, p.201, where Guéhenno defines revolution as a will to consciousness.
14. Guéhenno sees history as the history of revolution through the ages, but the only history he likes is "l'histoire de notre raison" (J.R. p.70).
15. See: J.R. p. 200, where Guéhenno claims that "la violence est contre-révolutionnaire".

16. See: *ibid.*, p.118, where Guéhenno writes: "L'histoire a un sens ... c'est l'accomplissement de l'homme dans tous les hommes".
This is also the spiritual goal of Guéhenno's revolution.
17. See: *ibid.*, pp.177-186.
18. See: *ibid.*, p.37, where Guéhenno enquires: "le Front populaire ... peut-on encore parler de victoire?"
19. See: *ibid.*, p.37, where Guéhenno remarks about the Front Populaire, that "si peu de chose a été fait de tout ce qui était possible".
20. Daniel Guérin, Front populaire révolution manquée. Paris, Maspero, 1970. p.135.
21. See: *ibid.*, p.136.
22. *Ibid.*, p.136.
23. Paul Warwick, The French Popular Front, p.21.
24. See: *ibid.*, p.26.
25. See: *ibid.*, p.39.
26. *Ibid.*, p.27.
27. See: Jules Moch, Le Front Populaire, grande espérance, p.190.
28. *Ibid.*, p.189.
29. See: *ibid.*, p.196.
30. See: *ibid.*, p.219.
31. *Ibid.*, p.266.
32. See: Paul Louis, Histoire du socialisme en France 1789-1945, p.389.
33. N. Greene, Crisis and Decline : The French Socialist Party in the Popular Front Era. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1969. p.74.

34. See: Daniel Guérin, Front populaire révolution manquée, p.161.
35. See: Paul Warwick, The French Popular Front, p.28.
36. See: *ibid.*, p.29.
37. A.-M. Petitjean, "Journal d'une "Révolution" par Jean Guéhenno," La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome L11, 1 juin 1939, p.1055.
38. See: *ibid.*, pp. 1054-1055.
39. *Ibid.*, p.1054.
40. See: J.R. p.158. Guéhenno draws a parallel here between 1913 and 1938: "Si 1938 était un nouveau 1913, si la guerre doit venir..."
41. See: *ibid.*, p.159, where Guéhenno states that "si la guerre vient, du moins suis-je certain de n'employer jamais cette plume à la justifier".
42. See: *ibid.*, p.186, where Guéhenno states that "des hommes ordinaires... ne sont pas comme ces énervés: ils respirent, toujours capables de prendre un souffle pour un nouvel effort. Et cet effort est leur vie même où s'accordent... ces idées... que les dialecticiens ne savent que séparer".
43. See: André Rousseaux, "La Vie Littéraire. Jean Guehenno. Journal d'une "Révolution"", Le Figaro, 13 mai 1939, p.6. Rousseaux claims that "Guéhenno (est) à la fois déraciné du peuple et un déraciné de l'église de campagne".
44. See: J.R. p.147, where Guéhenno confesses that "Sages de ce temps... nous sommes ivres de pureté. Mais nous voilà si loin des hommes".
45. Robert Brasillach, "Causerie Littéraire. Jean Guéhenno. Journal d'une "Révolution"", Action Française, 11 mai 1939.

46. André Rousseaux, "La Vie Littéraire. Jean Guéhenno.
Journal d'une "Révolution"", Le Figaro, 13 mai 1939, p.6.
47. See: Robert Brasillach, "Causerie Littéraire. Jean Guéhenno.
Journal d'une "Révolution"", Action Française, 11 mai 1939.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. This is one of those rare cases where Guéhenno is using the
term "revolution" in a political, rather than in a spiritual
sense.
51. The "Appendices" to Journal d'une "Révolution" include Guéhenno's
"Devoirs de la France", "La Mort inutile", "Examen de conscience:
L'Espagne et L'Europe" and "Au fond de l'absurde. Le pacifisme
n'est pas une tactique". All these articles were published
in Vendredi.
52. See: J.R. p.138, where Guéhenno states: "Je fuyais ma honte,
Honte de l'argent que je sentais dans mes poches... honte
de la sécurité..."
53. See: Thierry Maulnier, "Le Coeur de M. Guéhenno. Journal d'une
"Révolution"", Action Française, 25 mai 1939, p.7.
54. André Thérive, "Les Livres. Jean Guéhenno : Journal d'une
"Révolution"", Le Temps, 22 juin 1939, p.3.
55. This is the view of Mme. Annie Guéhenno, stated in conversation
with the author, on the 15th May 1984.
56. See: J.R. p.193.

57. Jeunesse de la France was dedicated to Guéhenno's friend from the École Normale Supérieure days, André Vaillant.
See: J.F. p.7. Guéhenno began writing Jeunesse de la France in August 1935, a fact stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 13th August 1935.
(In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). Jeunesse de la France was published in Europe in the issues of the 15th November 1935, pp. 313-341, the 15th December 1935, pp. 481-506, and the 15th February 1936, pp. 173-200. It was also published in Le Populaire, as this is mentioned in J.B. Séverac, "Les Livres. Jeunesse de la France par Jean Guéhenno" Le Populaire, 24 mars 1936. Jeunesse de la France was officially published in about March 1936, because this is when critical reviews of the book first appear.
58. See: Jean Grenier, "Jeunesse de la France par Jean Guéhenno; Retour à la France par Brice Parain", La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome XLVII, 1^{er} octobre 1936, p.725.
59. José Vincent, "Jeunesse de la France", La Croix, 3/4 mai 1936.
60. See: J.-B. Séverac, "Les Livres. Jeunesse de la France par Jean Guéhenno", Le Populaire, 24 mars 1936.
61. Joseph Stalin, "Discours au XVII^e Congrès du parti communiste", quoted in J.F. p.28.
62. See: L.P.D.F. p.90, where Guéhenno notes that after June 1940, the occupying authority "suspendit la diffusion et la vente (de Jeunesse de la France)". However, in C.D.V.E. p.171, Guéhenno claims that all his works were banned during the Occupation.

63. André Thérive, "Les Livres. Jean Guéhenno. Journal d'une "Révolution"," Le Temps, 22 juin 1939, p.3.
64. Ibid., p.3.
65. Ibid., p.3.
66. See: H. Stuart Hughes, The Obstructed Path, p.97.
67. See: *ibid.*, p.97.
68. See: J.R. p.74, where Guéhenno claims that "ce n'est point une dégradation de l'idéal républicain que de vouloir donner les emplois à la compétence et au mérite".
69. Diego Abad de Santillán, El Organismo Económico de la Revolución. Barcelona, 1936, quoted in J.R. p.55.
70. Murray Bookchin in his The Spanish Anarchists. The Heroic Years 1868-1936. New York, Free life editions, 1977. p.243, refers to Abad de Santillán as a major anarchist theorist.
71. Abad de Santillán quoted in *ibid.*, p.307.
72. See: A.M. Petitjean, "Journal d'une "Révolution" par Jean Guéhenno," La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome LII, 1^{er} juin 1939, p.1053.
73. Michel de Montaigne, Les Essais, in Les Essais de Michel de Montaigne, ed. Pierre Villey. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1978. p.3.
74. *Ibid.*, p.805.

76. The problem of the conservative perspective is however complicated by the fact that Guéhenno clearly regarded Montaigne as a revolutionary and in J.F. pp. 71-72 he included him in his list of revolutionary writers. Nevertheless Montaigne is a very conservative model for a writer to adopt in the 1930s. For an indication of how more modern writers saw Montaigne, look at the parody of his work in Louis-Ferdinand Céline, Voyage au bout de la nuit, Romans 1. Paris, Gallimard, Coll. Bibliothèque de la Pleiade, 1981. p.289.
76. Thierry Maulnier, "Le coeur de M. Guéhenno (Journal d'une Révolution)", Action Française 25 mai 1939, p.7.
77. André Rousseaux, "La Vie Littéraire. Jean Guéhenno, Journal d'une Révolution", Le Figaro, 13 mai 1939, p.6.
78. Pierre de Boisdeffre, Métamorphose de la littérature, vol.11, p.351.
79. Ibid., vol.11, p.412.
80. Ibid., vol.11, p.356.
81. See: H. Stuart Hughes, The Obstructed Path, pp. 235-236.
82. Albert Camus, L'Homme révolté, p.307.
83. See: H. Stuart Hughes, The Obstructed Path, p.237.
84. See: ibid., p.238.
85. See: D.L.D.P. p.163.
86. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 28th August 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
87. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 1st September 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

88. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 1st September 1939, Guéhenno writes: Je ne pense pas qu'il y aura la guerre!" (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
89. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 1st September 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
90. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 27th September 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
91. See: J.R. p.159.
92. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 30th September 1939. (In the collection of Me. Annie Guéhenno).
93. Ibid.
94. See: ibid.
95. This is stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 10th October 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
96. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 29th September 1939, Guéhenno writes: "j'aurais voulu rester à Paris". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
97. Guéhenno's address in Clermont-Ferrand is given in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 20th October 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). This same address is also given in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 16th November 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

98. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 19th October 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
99. This is stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 29th September 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
100. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 19th September 1939, Guéhenno mentions Jean Giono being arrested for having "tenu des propos défaitistes". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
101. This is stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 9th October 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
102. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 1st December 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
103. Ibid.
104. This is stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 1st December 1939. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
105. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 10th December 1939, Guéhenno states: "votre lettre me décide (pour Marianne). Je vais donc essayer". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
106. This is stated in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 15th January 1940. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

107. See: Jean Guéhenno, "Entre deux Mondes", Marianne,
24 janvier 1940.
108. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat
of the 28th January 1940, Guéhenno refers to the censorship
of his article and appears to accept it: "J'espère qu'il
paraîtra sans trop grandes mutilations". (In the collection
of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
109. In ibid., Guéhenno asks: "dites-moi... ce que vous pensez
de l'article de cette semaine "Entre deux Mondes".
110. On the subject of the Marianne articles, Guéhenno suspected
Paulhan's disapproval, so he wrote to him mentioning the
fact that: "j'ai besoin de votre approbation". From an
unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of
the 9th February 1940. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
111. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan
of the 5th July 1940, Guéhenno states: "Marianne... demande
des "grands papiers" sur la situation". (In the collection
of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
112. Guéhenno mentioned that Marianne deleted an essential paragraph
from his article, thereby changing the meaning of the text.
The offending paragraph stated that:

"La réforme de l'état... n'aura de sens...
que si elle va parallèle à cette réforme
des individus. Le travail de nos
"constituants" ne sera valable que si,
dédaignant toutes ces idéologies étrangères
...ils s'appliquent à penser la France...
Une constitution française ne peut être
qu'une constitution d'hommes libres".

From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan
of the 21st July 1940. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

113. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 18th February 1940. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). Earlier, in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 10th February 1940, Guehenno wrote to say that "j'ai été très malade ces 15 jours". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
114. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the spring of 1940, Guéhenno states that "je suis de nouveau malade et plein d'inquiétude". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno). Moreover, in an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Paulhan of the 5th July 1940, Guéhenno states that "je suis plein de désespoir". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
115. In an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 16th April 1940, Guéhenno states that "je voudrais composer un petit livre pour tous ceux que j'aime et que j'intitulerais Changer la vie". (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
116. From an unpublished letter from Jean Guéhenno to Jean Blanzat of the 6th April 1942. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
117. See: J.D.A.N., Introduction, p.8.
118. See: *ibid.*, 3 juin 1941, p.146.
119. See: J. Debû-Bridel, éd., La Résistance Intellectuelle. Paris, Julliard, 1970. p.31.

120. In the unpublished Jean Guéhenno. Curriculum vitae établi en 1945, Guéhenno states that he was Professeur de Première Supérieure at the Lycée Henri IV in 1940-1941, Professeur de Première Supérieure at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand in 1941-1943 and Professeur de Seconde at the Lycée Buffon in 1943-1944. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
121. See: J.J. Part 1. p.81.
122. In Jean-Jacques Guéhenno also refers to the possibility of having "natural laws" which every individual can understand. See: J.J. Part 2. p.53.
123. See: *ibid.*, Part 1. p.17.
124. See: V. p.30.
125. See: *ibid.*, p.174.
126. See: *ibid.*, p.176.
127. See: *ibid.*, p.180.
128. Guéhenno was appointed to this post in 1945 and retained it until his retirement in 1961. See: The unpublished biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno by Mme. Annie Guéhenno. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).
129. See: S.L.C.H. p.90.
130. See: *ibid.*, p.166.
131. See: *ibid.*, p.97.
132. See: *ibid.*, p.155.
133. See: F.D. pp.12-13.
134. See: *ibid.*, pp.18-19.
135. For Guéhenno's critique of communism, see: *ibid.*, pp.179-181.

136. See: *ibid.*, p.30.
137. For Guéhenno's account of his activities in the Lettres Françaises and the C.N.E., see: *ibid.*, pp. 224-226.
138. Guéhenno refers to his work on Changer la vie in J.D.A.N. 17 juillet 1940, p.25 and 15 septembre 1940, p.44.
139. See: C.V. pp. 94-103.
140. See: *ibid.*, pp. 115-121, where Guéhenno admits that his father's illness and resulting inability to finance his studies were the sole reasons for his entering the shoe factory.
141. See: C.Q.J.C. p.66.
142. See: C.D.V.E. p.8, for the already quoted remark: "Le titre de l'un de mes premiers livres annonçait toute ma vie: Caliban parle".
143. See: *ibid.*, p.172.
144. See: J.D.A.N. Editor's notes, p.8.
145. Professor Max Milner of the Université de Dijon, who was a pupil of Guéhenno during the Occupation, stated in conversation with the author on the 28th February 1984, that given his reputation in the 1930s, the idea of Guéhenno in the Académie Française was unthinkable to those who knew him until well after 1945.
146. Jean Guéhenno quoted in Alain Decaux, Discours... p.22.
147. Stated in conversation with the author by Professor Max Milner of the Université de Dijon on the 28th February 1984.

Bibliography

1. Bibliographies consulted

Biblio. Catalogue des ouvrages parus en langue français dans le monde entier. Paris, Messageries Hachette, 1940.

Bibliographie de la littérature française de 1800 à 1930, Hugo.

P. Thieme éd. Paris, Librairie E. Droz, 1933, tome 1.

Bibliographie de la littérature française de 1930 à 1939, S. Dreher and M. Rolli éd. Lille, Librairie Giard, 1948.

Bibliographie de la littérature française de 1940 à 1949. M. L. Prevet éd. Lille, Librairie Giard, 1954.

Bibliographie der Französischen Literatur wissenschaft, Otto Klapp éd. Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klosterman, 1960, band 1.

Bibliographie der Französischen Literatur wissenschaft, Otto Klapp éd. Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1980. Band XVII and XVIII.

Bibliographie des auteurs modernes de langue française 1801-1941, H. Talvart and J. Place éd. Paris, Éditions de la Chronique des Lettres Françaises, coll. Aux Horizons de France, 1941.

Bibliographie des Revues et Journaux Littéraires des XIX et XX siècles, J.-M. Place and A. Vasseur éd. Paris, Éditions Jean-Michel Place, 1977. Vol. 111.

Bibliographie sommaire, Mme Annie Guéhenno éd., (unpublished). (In the collection of Mme Annie Guéhenno.)

The British Library. Catalogue of the Newspaper Library Colindale. London, British Museum Publications, 1975. Vol. 5.

British Museum, General Catalogue of Printed Books. London, Trustees of the British Museum, 1961. Vol. 93.

British Museum, General Catalogue of Printed Books. Ten Year Supplement 1956-1965. London, Trustees of the British Museum, 1968. Vol. 18.

Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale.

Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1929. tome LXV.

Catalogue Valdras. Nendeln (Liechtenstein), Kraus reprints, 1971.

Dictionnaire de Biographie Française. Paris, Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1967.

French VII Bibliography. New York, French Institute, 1968. Vols. 2-20.

French XX Bibliography. New York, French Institute, 1969, Vol. 21.

Joseph Kvapil, "Bibliographie", in his Romain Rolland et les amis d'Europe, Prague, Statní Pedagogické Nakladatelství, 1971.

La Librairie Française. Auteurs, Tables décennales. Paris, Au cercle de la Librairie, 1966.

Les Livres Disponibles 1980-1981, Auteurs. Paris, Grasset, 1981.

The National Union Catalog. Pre-1956 reprints. London, Mansell, 1972.
Vol. 221.

Who's Who in France 1977-1978. Paris, Éditions Jacques Lafitte, 1977.

2. Work by Jean Guéhenno

a) Books by Jean Guéhenno

Jean Guéhenno, L'Évangile éternel. Paris, Grasset, 1927.

Jean Guéhenno, Caliban parle. Paris, Grasset, coll. "Les Écrits", 1928.

Jean Guéhenno, Simon Mondzain. Paris, Éditions de la Nouvelle Revue Française, 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, Conversion à l'humain. Paris, Grasset, 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, Journal d'un homme de 40 ans. Paris, Grasset, 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, Jeunesse de la France. Paris, Grasset, 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, Journal d'une "Révolution". Paris, Grasset, 1939.

Jacques Cévennes (pseud. clandestin), Dans la prison. Rio de Janeiro, Éditions de minuit (en clandestinité), 1943.

Cévennes, Cahier ... L'Orphéon Aulnay-sous-Bois, Nouvelle série des Cahiers de l'Orphéon, s.d.

Jean Guéhenno, La France dans le monde. Paris, Éditions de la Liberté, 1946.

Jean Guéhenno, Journal des années noires (1940-1944). Paris, Gallimard, 1947.

Jean Guéhenno, Jean-Jacques en marge des Confessions (1712-1758). Paris, Grasset, 1948.

Jean Guéhenno, La part de la France, Geneva, Éd. de Mont-Blanc, coll. Espaces, 1949.

Jean Guéhenno, Jean-Jacques 1750-1758. Roman et vérité. Paris, Grasset, 1951.

Jean Guéhenno, Jean-Jacques 1758-1778. Grandeur et misère d'un esprit. Paris, Gallimard, 1952.

Jean Guéhenno, Voyages. Tournée américaine. Tournée africaine.
Paris, Gallimard, 1952.

Jean Guéhenno, Aventures de l'esprit. Paris, Gallimard, 1954.

Jean Guéhenno, La France et les noirs. Paris, Gallimard, 1954.

Jacques Cévennes, Patiences.... Aulnay-sous-Bois, Seine-et-Oise,
G. Sénéchal, 1955.

Jean Guéhenno, La Foi difficile. Paris, Grasset, 1957.

Jean Guéhenno, Sur le chemin des hommes. Paris, Grasset,
coll. Les Cahiers Verts. Nouvelle série, 52, 1959.

Jean Guéhenno, Changer la vie. Mon enfance et ma jeunesse.
Paris, Grasset, coll. Les Cahiers Verts, 1961.

Jean Guéhenno, Notes. Paris, Éditions Estienne, coll. Les
Inédits Estienne, 1963.

Jean Guéhenno, Ce que je crois. Paris, Grasset, coll. Ce que
je crois et Cahiers Verts, 1964.

Jean Guéhenno, La Mort des autres. Paris, Grasset, 1968.

Jean Guéhenno, Caliban et Prospero. Paris, Gallimard, 1969.

Jean Guéhenno, Carnets du vieil écrivain. Paris. Grasset, 1971.

Jean Guéhenno, Dernières lumières, derniers plaisirs. Paris,
Grasset, 1977.

Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir. Paris, Grasset, 1978.

b) Collaborations involving Jean Guéhenno

Jean Guéhenno, "Voltaire", in Tableau de la littérature Française. XVII^e-XVIII^e siècle. De Corneille à Chénier. Paris, Gallimard, 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Dabit", in Hommage à Dabit. Paris, Gallimard, 1939.

Jean Guéhenno, "Le heros de l'Europe", in Hommage à Romain Rolland. Geneva, Mont Blanc, 1945.

Jean Guéhenno, "Fragments", in La Patrie se fait tous les jours. Paris, Éditions de minuit, 1947.

Jean Guéhenno, "Zola", in Présence de Zola. Paris, Fasquelle, 1953.

Jean Guéhenno, in Jean Guéhenno, Pierre Breillat, Germaine Lebel, Paule Masson, Paul Poindron, Lecture publique rurale et urbaine. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1956.

Jean Guéhenno, "Enseigner sa langue", in M. Domerc, G. Hyvernaud et J. Sirinell, Plaisir de lire. Paris, A. Colin, 1961.

Jean Guéhenno, "Une grande conscience", in Romain Rolland. Neuchâtel, Université ouvrière et faculté des lettres de l'Université de Genève, 1969.

c) Prefaces by Jean Guéhenno

Jean Guéhenno, "Préface", in Martel (Pierre Estienne) psued.,
La rencontre de Cervantès et du Quichotte. Paris, Grasset, 1927.

Jean Guéhenno, "Préface", in Michael Farbman, Piatiletka
(Le plan russe), trad. Jeanne Guéhenno. Paris, Rieder, 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Préface", in J. J. Rousseau, Les Rêveries du
promeneur solitaire. Paris, Éditions de la Bibliothèque mondiale, 1956.

Jean Guéhenno, "In memoriam", in Jacques Desjardins, La Parole
intérieure. Paris, Hachette, 1957.

Jean Guéhenno, "Présentation", in Comte L. Tolstoï, La mort
d'Ivan Ilitch et autres contes. Paris, A. Colin, 1958.

Jean Guéhenno, "Préface", in R. Gimpel, Journal d'un collectionneur
marchand de tableaux. Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1963.

Jean Guéhenno, "Préface", in Gaspard Bovier, Journal du séjour à
Grenoble de J. J. Rousseau. Grenoble, Roissard, 1964.

Jean Guéhenno, "Préface", in Plaisir de lire (Collection
littéraire sous la direction de Jean Guéhenno). Paris, Armand
Colin, 1965.

Jean Guéhenno, "Préface", in Marie Simone Renou, L'Inde que
j'aime. Paris, Éditions Sun, 1968.

Jean Guéhenno, "Introduction", in Bernard Le Bouyer de Fontenelle,
"Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes" suivis de "Histoire des
oracles" et des "Oeuvres mêlées". Paris, Vialetay, 1970.

Jean Guéhenno, "Introduction", in Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Les
Confessions. Paris, Le Club des classiques, 1970.

Jean Guéhenno, "Préface", in Romain Rolland, Les chefs-d'oeuvre de Romain Rolland. Paris, Le cercle du bibliophile, 1970.

Jean Guéhenno, "Preface", in J. Cressot, Le Pain au Lièvre. Paris, Editions Stock, 1973.

d) Published Speeches by Jean Guéhenno

Jean Guéhenno, "Interventions", in André Gide et notre temps (Entretien tenu au siège de l'Union pour la vérité le 23 janvier 1935), Bulletin de l'Union pour la vérité, avril-mai 1935, nos. 7-8.

Jean Guéhenno, "Discours prononcé a l'Association Internationale de Écrivains", Vendredi, 7 novembre 1935, p. 3.

Jean Guéhenno, "Conférence prononcé au Palais de Chaillot le 8 mars 1945", in L'Université dans la résistance et dans la France nouvelle. Paris, Office Français d'édition, 1945.

Jean Guéhenno, Esprit européen ... avec d'autres conférences. Neuchâtel, La Baconnière, Rencontres Internationales de Genève, 1947.

Jean Guéhenno, "Discours", in Académie française ... Discours (de Jean Guéhenno et de Jacques Chastenet) ... pour la réception de Jean Guéhenno le ... 6 décembre 1962. Paris, Institut de France, 1962.

Jean Guéhenno, Deuxième centenaire de la naissance de Chateaubriand, discours prononcé a Saint-Mâlo par Jean Guéhenno ... le 4 septembre 1968. Paris, Institut de France, 1968.

Jean Guéhenno, Académie Française ... Discours à l'occasion de la mort de ... Vladimir d'Ormesson ... Georges Izard ... le 27 septembre 1973. Paris, Institut de France, 1973.

Jean Guéhenno, "Intervention de M. J. Guéhenno de l'Académie Française (séance de 4 juillet 1978)", Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, 79, pgs. 498-500.

e) Articles by Jean Guéhenno in Europe

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes", in Jules Michelet, "Avenir!", Europe, janvier 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Péguy, Jaurès", Europe, février 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Michelet et le XIX^e siècle" Europe, mars 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Sur Lénine", Europe, avril 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Maurice Barrès", Europe, mai 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La vie est un art", Europe, juin 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture, En deça de la Révolution", Europe, juillet 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Clio", Europe, août 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, Notes de lecture, Clio" Europe, septembre 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Culture Européenne et dénationalisation", Europe, octobre 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Esthétisme et critique", Europe. novembre 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Sur une lettre de M. André Gide", Europe, décembre 1929.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le secret", Europe
janvier 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Lettre ouverte à M.J.Benda",
Europe, février 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Comptes Rendus", Europe, février 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Sages?", Europe, mars 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture, La Vie des autres",
Europe, avril 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Les réfractaires", Europe,
mai 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos de Goethe",
Europe, juin 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Une vie poétique. Henry de
Montherlant", Europe, juillet 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Nos Ancêtres" Europe. août 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Un sorcier: Le Comte Keyserling",
Europe, septembre 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Léon Trotski", Europe,
octobre 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Âme ma belle âme", Europe,
novembre 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Difficiles amours",
Europe, décembre 1930.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Benjamin Constant", Europe, janvier 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos du "plan Quinquennal", Europe, février 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Deux hommes", Europe, mars 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Viêt-Nam", Europe, avril 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Sur Descartes", Europe, mai 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes, in Michel Farbman, "Le plan russe", Europe, mai 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture, À propos de Nietzsche", Europe, juin 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture, Les paroles restent", Europe, juillet 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Regards sur le monde actuel (Paul Valéry)", Europe, août 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Instituteur", Europe, septembre 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Inventaire", Europe, octobre 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La montagne magique", Europe, novembre 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Littérature prolétarienne", Europe, décembre 1931.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Littérature prolétarienne II",
Europe, janvier 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Réflexions sur Barrès",
Europe, février 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Les Intellectuels et le
désarmement", Europe, mars 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos de Diderot", Europe,
avril 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Les hommes de bonne volonté",
Europe, mai 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Notre Jeunesse", Europe,
juin 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. D'homme a homme", Europe,
juillet 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La Contre-Révolution",
Europe, août 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Précisions", Europe,
septembre 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le système de circonlocutions",
Europe, octobre 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Les sourds", Europe,
novembre 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Littérature et politique",
Europe, décembre 1932.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Encore Nietzsche", Europe, janvier 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Monsieur Gide", Europe, février 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos d'une histoire de la guerre", Europe, mars 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le Nationalisme Allemand", Europe, avril 1933.

Jean Guehenno, "Notes de lecture. Réflexions sur l'Europe", Europe, mai 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La Condition humaine", Europe, juin 1933

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La nature humaine est-elle en train de changer en Russie?", Europe, juillet 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. More brain, ô lord...", Europe, août 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Un journal de la guerre et de la révolution", Europe, septembre 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Nuit de septembre", Europe, octobre 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture, Jaurès ou la révolution rationnelle", Europe, novembre 1933.

Jean Guehenno, "Notes de lecture. La jeune France et la jeune Europe", Europe, décembre 1933.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Fin de siècle, 1903-1933",
Europe, janvier 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La Révolution vécue",
Europe, février 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Journal", Europe, mars 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Les Tricheurs", Europe, avril 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le message de Lawrence d'après
sa correspondance", Europe, mai 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le message de Lawrence d'après
sa correspondance II", Europe, juin 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La République de Petits gens",
Europe, juillet 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe, août 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Jaurès", Europe, août 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe, septembre 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. À propos d'un plan et d'une
méthode", Europe, septembre 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe, octobre 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. En lisant Marx", Europe,
octobre 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe, novembre 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Comme des sources au fond des
bois", Europe, décembre 1934.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Alexandre aux Indes",
Europe, janvier 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Décandence de la vertu",
Europe, février 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Plaidoyer pour les Instituteurs et les
Professeurs poursuivis", Europe, mars 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Amor fati", Europe, mars 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Vouloir la paix", Europe, avril 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. De Montaigne à Lénine",
Europe, mai 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Appel au poète d'aujourd'hui", Europe, juin 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Discours prononcé le 21 juin 1935 au Congrès
International des Écrivains pour la Défense de la Culture.
" Défense de la Culture"", Europe, juillet 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture . Valeur d'une fête", Europe,
août 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. La lettre anonyme", Europe,
septembre 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Henri Barbusse", Europe,
octobre 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Jeunesse de la France I", Europe, novembre 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture, 27 septembre 1935", Europe,
novembre 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Jeunesse de la France II", Europe,
décembre 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Le Dernier Sage",
Europe, décembre 1935.

Jean Guéhenno, "Notes de lecture. Pour le 70 anniversaire
de Romain Rolland", Europe, janvier 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Jeunesse de la France III", Europe, février 1936.

f) Articles by Jean Guéhenno in Vendredi

Jean Guéhenno, "La guerre est à droite", Vendredi, No. 10,
11 janvier 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Les héros de l'Europe", Vendredi, No.12,
24 janvier 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Chant de confiance en Russie", Vendredi,
No.16, 21 février 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Briand le précurseur", Vendredi, No.18,
6 mars 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Printemps en France. La République recommence",
Vendredi, No.25, 24 avril 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Au fond de l'Absurde : le pacifisme n'est pas
une tactique", Vendredi, No.26, 1 mai 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Pour le 1 mai. Fête d'Hercule", Vendredi,
No.26, 1 mai 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Liberté", Vendredi, No.36, 10 juillet 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Jean Jaurès ou l'Appel à la Raison,
Vendredi, No.39, 31 juillet 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Devoirs de la France", Vendredi, No.50,
16 octobre 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Un ami", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Avertissements", Vendredi, No.53, 6 novembre 1936.

Jean Guéhenno, "Les procès de Moscou - La Mort inutile",
Vendredi, No.66, 5 février 1937.

Jean Guéhenno "Ce que c'est qu'un Nazi", Vendredi, No.77,
23 avril 1937.

Jean Guéhenno, "Dix jours d'Algérie, ou la misère au soleil",
Vendredi, No.85, 18 juin 1937.

Jean Guéhenno, "Examen de Conscience - L'Espagne et l'Europe",
Vendredi, No.88, 9 juillet 1937.

Jean Guéhenno, "Devenons nous plus bêtes?", Vendredi,
No.95, 26 août 1937.

Jean Guéhenno, "Sur la naissance de la III République",
Vendredi, No.97, 9 septembre 1937.

Jean Guéhenno, "Ce que peuvent des paroles simples et pures",
Vendredi, No.102, 15 octobre 1937.

Jean Guéhenno, "Lettre ouverte à A. Gide", Vendredi, No.111,
17 décembre 1937.

Jean Guéhenno, "Réponse à A. Gide", Vendredi, No.112,
24 décembre 1937.

Jean Guéhenno, "L'asile du bonheur, ou les devoirs, des gens heureux", Vendredi, No.114, 7 janvier 1938.

Jean Guéhenno, "La radio et l'esprit", Vendredi, No.116, 21 janvier 1938.

Jean Guéhenno, "Au fond de l'Absurde : le pacifisme n'est pas une tactique", Vendredi, No.126, 1 avril 1938.

Jean Guéhenno, "Au devant de la vie", Vendredi, No.132, 13 mai 1938.

Jean Guéhenno, "Tunisie 1938", Vendredi, No.145, 12 août 1938.

g) Articles written in conjunction with André Chamson and Andrée Viollis

A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Lettre à Pierre Laval", Vendredi, No.4, 28 novembre 1935.

A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Histoire de Vendredi", Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936.

A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Réponse" (à Léon Jouhaux), Vendredi, No.32, 12 juin 1936.

Comité directeur (A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno), "Bataille pour notre liberté", Vendredi, No.75, 9 avril 1937.

A. Chamson, A. viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Le sénat contre le pays: La France aura raison", Vendredi, No.86, 25 juin 1937.

A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno, "Après deux ans: nous maintiendrons", Vendredi, No.101, 8 octobre 1937.

Comité Directeur (A. Chamson, A. Viollis, J. Guéhenno),
"Déclaration", Vendredi, No. 132, 13 mai 1938.

h) Miscellaneous articles by Jean Guéhenno

Jean Guéhenno, "Whitman, Wilson et l'Esprit moderne", La Revue de Paris, 1 janvier 1919.

Jean Guéhenno, "Les sens du Monde," La Grande Revue, avril 1919.

Jean Guéhenno, "Entre le passé et l'avenir, La Grande Revue, mai 1919.

Jean Guéhenno, "Le Sens du Peuple", La Grande Revue, juin 1919.

Jean Guéhenno, "Le Message de l'Orient : Rabindranath Tagore",
La Revue de Paris, 1 septembre 1919.

Jean Guéhenno, "Les relations intellectuelles entre la France
et l'Allemagne," La Grande Revue, avril 1922.

Jean Guéhenno, "Mesure de la France, par Pierre Drieu La Rochelle",
Les Cahiers Verts, Paris, Grasset, 1926.

Jean Guéhenno, "Journal des vacances 1937-1938", La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome LII, 1 mars 1939.

Jean Guéhenno, "Journal des vacances 1937-1938", La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome LII, 1 avril 1939.

Jean Guéhenno, "Entre deux Mondes", Marianne, 24 janvier 1940.

i) Correspondence

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - Jean Blanzat,
1929-1942. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - Jean-Richard Bloch, 1929-1935, in Fonds J.R. Bloch, Papiers J.R. Bloch, Lettres adressées à J.R. Bloch XXII. Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises.

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - Jean Giono, 1929-1935, (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - Louis Guilloux, 1927-1967, (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - René Lalou, 1934-1957. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - André Malraux, 1930-1975. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - Roger Martin du Gard, 1930-1936. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - François Mauriac, 1939-1964. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - Jean Paulhan, 1929-1943. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Jean Paulhan, "Lettre à Jean Guéhenno de 1943", La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome XLVIII, octobre 1976, pp. 119-120.

Correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - Romain Rolland, 1919-1944, in Cahiers Romain Rolland. Cahier 23, "L'indépendance de l'esprit". Correspondence entre Jean Guéhenno et Romain Rolland 1919-1944. Paris, Éditions Albin Michel, 1975.

Unpublished correspondence, Jean Guéhenno - Jules Romains, 1930-1954. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

3. Unpublished work by Jean Gu henno.

Jean Guéhenno, "L'Art et le peuple au XIX siècle" (Discours prononcé à la radio le 5 mai 1931). (Tape recording in the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Jean Guéhenno, Jean Guéhenno - Curriculum Vitae établi en 1945.
(In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Jean Guéhenno, Notes on Europe for a radio programme with
P. Sipriot in 1975. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

4. Published work on Jean Guéhenno.

Anon., Henri Coulet, Jean Deprun, Maurice Genevoix,
Jean-Pierre Richard, Jean Guéhenno, Extrait de l'Annuaire
des Anciens Élèves de l'École Normale Supérieure. Paris,
École Normale Supérieure, 1979.

Georges Albert, "Jeunesse de la France", La Flèche, 18 avril 1936.

Paul Archambault, "Révolte et désespoir de Jean Guéhenno",
Petit Démocrate, 16 octobre 1934.

Robin Armand, "Jean Guéhenno : À propos du Journal d'une "révolution"",
Esprit, tome 7, 1939, No.81.

Claude Barjac, "Nos débutants d'hier : M. Jean Guéhenno",
La Grande Revue, tome 145.

Henri Bauchau, "Journal d'un homme...", Cité Chrétienne,
20 décembre 1934.

Jean Baudry, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Revue Hebdomadaire,
9 février 1935.

Paul Bay, "De Gauche à Droite (Guéhenno)", Le Thyrses, 1 avril 1935.

Albert Bayet, "Caliban parle", Lumière, 8 décembre 1928.

Julien Benda, "Culture et Bourgeoisie, Lettre à J. Guéhenno",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 2 février 1929.

Julien Benda, "Lettre à Jean Guéhenno", La Nouvelle Revue Française,
XXXIV, avril 1930.

Emmanuel Berl, "Caliban parle", La Revue Européenne, février 1929.

Emmanuel Berl, "Conversion à l'humain", Les Nouvelles Littéraires,
29 août 1931.

Emmanuel Berl, "Guéhenno et la Révolution", Pavés de Paris,
19 mai 1939.

André Billy, "Ouvrages divers", L'Oeuvre, 11 octobre 1927.

André Billy, "Conversion à l'Humain", L'Oeuvre, 7 septembre 1931.

Robert Brasillach, "Jean Guéhenno", Journal d'un homme de 40 ans,
Action Française, 3 janvier 1935.

Robert Brasillach, "Jeunesse de la France", Action Française,
9 avril 1936.

Robert Brasillach, "Causerie littéraire. Jean Guéhenno - Journal
d'une "Révolution"", Action Française, 11 mai 1939.

Gabriel Brunet, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Mercure de France,
1 février 1935.

Emmanuel Buenzod, "L'Évangile éternel", Gazette de Lausanne,
30 octobre 1927.

G.-L.C., "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Le Journal, 17 janvier 1935.

J. Cabry, "Un Chrétien contre l'Évangile : Jean Guéhenno",
La Nouvelle Revue des Jeunes, 15 octobre 1932.

Candido, "Jean Guéhenno et la sincérité", Corriere del la Serra,
26 janvier 1935.

André Chamson article, in Hommage à Jean Guéhenno. Paris,
Armand Colin, 1962.

R. Clauzel, "L'Évangile éternel", Ève, 8 avril 1928.

Nelly Cormeau, "Jean Guéhenno : Journal des années noires",
Synthèses, 1947, No.7.

Józef Czapski, "Jean Guéhenno", Wiadomości Literackie, 7 avril 1929.

J. Debû-Bridel, Notes on Jean Guéhenno in, La Résistance Intellectuelle - textes et témoignages réunis et présentés par J. Debû-Bridel. Paris, Juilliard, 1970.

Alain Decaux, "Discours", in Discours prononcés dans la séance publique tenue par l'Académie Française pour la réception de M. Alain Decaux le jeudi 13 mars 1980. Paris, Institut de France, 1980.

J. Ernest-Charles, "Cabotins et humanité (L'Évangile éternel)", La Dépêche Coloniale, 22 octobre 1927.

Raymond Escholier, "L'Évangile éternel", Le Petit Journal, 27 décembre 1927.

"Europe", "Informations", Europe, avril 1929.

Ramon Fernandez, "Caliban parle", La Nouvelle Revue Française, XXXII, 1 février 1929.

Ramon Fernandez, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Marianne, 9 janvier 1935.

Jean Gaulmier, "Adieu à Guéhenno" Etudes Renaniennes, 37, (3^e trim. 1978).

Jean Grenier, "Jeunesse de la France" par Jean Guéhenno; Retour à la France par Brice Parain", La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome XLVII, 1^{er} octobre 1936.

René M. Guastalla, "Journal d'une "Révolution"", La Flèche, 20 mai 1939.

Louis Guilloux, "Lettre sur Caliban parle", L'Aube, 15 février 1929.

H.D. Hill, "Caliban parle", Saturday Review, 23rd November 1929.

"L'homme qui lit", "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans, par Jean Guéhenno",
Le Figaro, 17 novembre 1934, p.5.

Pierre Humbourg, "Journal d'un homme...", L'Ami du peuple,
17 décembre 1934.

Robert Kanters, "Guéhenno, le socialisme à visage littéraire",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires. 28 février 1980.

Robert Kemp, "L'Évangile éternel", La Liberté, 3 novembre 1927.

Robert Kemp, "Caliban parle", La Liberté, 17 décembre 1928.

Robert Kemp, "Les Livres", La Liberté, 7 septembre 1934.

Robert Kemp, "La vie des Livres, journaux intimes", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 1948, No. 1079.

René Lalou, "Conversion à l'Humain", La Quinzaine Critique,
10-15 septembre 1931.

René Lalou, "Le livre de la semaine. Journal d'un homme de 40 ans",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 24 novembre 1934.

René Lalou, "Jeunesse de la France", Vendredi, No.31, 3 avril 1936.

René Lalou, "Le livre de la semaine. Jeunesse de la France",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 18 avril 1936.

René Lalou, "Le livre de la semaine. Journal des années noires
par Jean Guéhenno", Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 1947, No.103.

Louis Le Sidaner, "Deux livres de Jean Guéhenno", La Nouvelle
Revue critique, août 1931.

A. Lecomte, "Jeunesse de la France", La Jeune République, 14 juin 1936.

Frédéric Lefèvre, "Une heure avec Robert Garric et Jean Guéhenno",
Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 2 février 1929.

Pierre Loewel, "Journal d'une "Révolution"", L'Ordre, 26 juin 1939.

H.M. "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Le Divan, mars-avril 1935.

Jacques Madaule, "D'Henri Massis à Jean Guéhenno", La vie intellectuelle, 10 janvier 1935.

André Malraux, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", La Nouvelle Revue Française, Tome XLIV, 1 janvier 1935.

Gabriel Marcel, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Europe Nouvelle,
26 janvier 1935.

Thierry Maulnier, "Le conformisme de M. Guéhenno", Action Française,
5 mars 1931.

Thierry Maulnier, "Le Bilan de M. Jean Guéhenno", La Revue Universelle,
1 janvier 1935.

Thierry Maulnier, "Un nouvel aspect de l'Histoire littéraire",
Action Française, 16 janvier 1936.

Thierry Maulnier, "Le coeur de M. Guéhenno (Journal d'une Révolution)",
Action Française, 25 mai 1939.

François Mauriac, "Jean Guéhenno", Le Figaro, 6 août 1946.

C. Mayran, "Réflexions sur Caliban parle de M. Jean Guéhenno",
La Nouvelle revue des Jeunes, 25 juillet 1929.

André Montaigne, "Jeunesse de la France", Lumière, 13 juin 1936.

Pascal Ory, "Introduction", in Jean Guéhenno, Entre le passé et l'avenir.

Henri du Passage " Jeunesse de la France", Études, 20 mai 1936.

A.M. Petitjean, "Journal d'une "Révolution" par Jean Guéhenno",
La Nouvelle Revue Française, tome LII, 1^{er} juin 1939.

Henriette Psichari, "Jean Guéhenno parle", L'Éducation,
25 novembre 1971, no.119.

L. Rivière, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Polybiblion, mai 1935.

André Rousseaux, "Le cas de M. Guéhenno", Le Figaro, 10 octobre 1931,

André Rousseaux, "La Semaine Littéraire. Un jeune vieillard",
Le Figaro, 1 septembre 1934.

André Rousseaux, "Propos du Samedi", Le Figaro, 28 mars 1936.

André Rousseaux, "La Vie Littéraire. Jean Guéhenno, Journal d'une
Révolution", Le Figaro, 13 mai 1939.

André Rousseaux, "Journal des années noires de Jean Guéhenno,
Le Figaro Littéraire, 1947, No.63.

Christian Sénéchal, "Jean Guéhenno et la Culture du peuple",
Die Neueren Sprachen, 1931.

J.-B. Séverac, "L'Évangile éternel", Le Populaire, 30 septembre 1927.

J.-B. Séverac, "Conversion à l'humain", Le Populaire. 1 octobre 1931.

J.-B. Séverac, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Le Populaire,
25 décembre 1934.

J.-B. Séverac, "Les Livres. Jeunesse de la France par Jean Guéhenno",
Le Populaire, 24 mars 1936.

Paul Souday, "Caliban parle", Le Temps, 4 avril 1929.

Fortunat Strowski, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Le Quotidien,
4 décembre 1934.

André Thérive, "Les Livres", Le Temps, 24 janvier 1935.

André Thérive, "Idéalisme républicain", Europe Nouvelle, 2 mai 1936.

André Thérive, "Jeunesse de la France", Le Temps, 28 mai 1936.

André Thérive, "Les Livres. Jean Guéhenno. Journal d'une
"Révolution"", Le Temps, 22 juin 1939.

Albert Thibaudet, "L'Évangile éternel", Candide, 13 octobre 1927.

Albert Thibaudet, "Caliban parle", Candide, 6 décembre 1928.

J.-G. Tricot, "Jeunesse de la France", Revue Bibliographique
et Critique, mars 1936.

René Trintzius, "Conversion à l'humain", Cahiers du Sud,
1 juillet 1931.

Gonzague Truc, "Caliban parle", Comeodia, 15 janvier 1929.

Pierre Unik, "Les Livres, Fausse et vraie jeunesse",
L'Humanité, 23 mai 1936.

José Vincent, "Jeunesse de la France", La Croix, 3/4 mai 1936.

Franz Weyergans, "Mission de la France", Rex, 24 avril 1936.

Alfred Wild, "Où sont les conformistes? Enquête", Le Figaro,
20 août 1932.

Alfred Wild, "Journal d'un homme de 40 ans", Présence,
février 1935.

Alfred Wild, "Jeunesse de la France" Le Progrès de Lyon,
17 avril 1936.

5. Unpublished work on Jean Guéhenno and his family.

Agendas de Paul Desjardins, Fichier des noms cités, établie
par M. Leleu pour le compte du C.N.R.S. November 1927 -
May 1929. (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Diplôme de Bachelier de l'Enseignement secondaire de Jean Guéhenno,
which is dated Rennes, 24.7.1907. (In the collection of
Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Diplôme de Réception de Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Union Compagnonnique
des compagnons du Tour de France des devoirs unis, Fougères.

16.X.1895, Lyon 14.IX.1905, (In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Mme. Annie Guéhenno, Biographical notes on Jean Guéhenno. (In the
collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Photograph of Anna de Noailles with dedication to Jean Guéhenno.
(In the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

Photograph of Jean Guéhenno at La Rochecorbon. (In the collection
of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

P. Sipriot, "Hommage à Jean Guéhenno", Radio-France, 29 septembre
1978. (Tape recording in the collection of Mme. Annie Guéhenno).

6. Articles from Europe (other than those by Jean Guéhenno),
cited in the text.

Anon., "Le procès de George Grosz", Europe, avril 1929.

Anon., "Petition pour Henri Guilbeaux", Europe, avril 1929.

Anon., "L'Affaire Foch-Marty", Europe, février 1930.

Anon., "Jugement et mort de Sacco et de Vanzetti", Europe,
novembre 1930.

Anon., "Documents : Le jeûne de Gandhi", Europe, octobre 1932.

Anon., "Documents : Tagore et Gandhi pendant le jeûne", Europe,
novembre 1932.

Anon., "Petition pour Henri Guilbeaux", Europe, novembre 1932.

Anon., "Résistance intellectuelle au fascisme", Europe, mai 1934.

Alain, "Vingt ans après", Europe, novembre 1934.

Prosper Alfaric, "La campagne anti-religieuse en Russie",
Europe, juillet 1930.

Emmanuel Berl, "Mort de la morale bourgeoise", Europe,
15 novembre 1929.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Paganisation de la pensée
contemporaine", Europe, août 1929.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Du Symbolisme", Europe,
avril 1930.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. La Russie est-elle encore
une patrie?", Europe, novembre 1930.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. De la Vulgarisation",
Europe, novembre 1931.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. L'Unité du monde", Europe, mars 1932.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Objections de conscience", Europe, novembre 1932.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires, Paroles à un congrès soviétique", Europe, septembre 1934.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Lettre", Europe, novembre 1934.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. Mort et résurrection de Moscou", Europe, mars 1935.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. D'Erasmus à Proust", Europe, mai 1935.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Création Littéraire et société humaine", Europe, juillet 1935.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. D'Erasmus à Proust", Europe, août 1935.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Commentaires. D'Erasmus à Proust", Europe, octobre 1935.

André Chamson, "Le nationalisme contre les réalités nationales", Europe, juillet 1935.

Eugène Dabit, "Témoignage", Europe, novembre 1934.

Max Eastman, "Contre la dialectique marxiste", Europe, mai 1934.

"Europe", "À l'ambassadeur de Chine, à Paris", Europe, janvier 1932.

"Europe", "Aux abonnés et aux lecteurs d'Europe", Europe, avril 1936.

Michel Farbman, "Le plan russe", Europe, mai 1931.

Michel Farbman, "La signification internationale du plan de Cinq ans", Europe, décembre 1931.

Georges Friedmann, "Machine et humanisme", Europe, juillet 1935.

Georges Friedmann, "Travail et communion en l'U.R.S.S.", Europe, septembre 1935.

M.K. Gandhi, "Lettre au vice-roi des Indes", Europe, juillet 1930.

Pierre Gerôme, "Commentaire du manifeste", Europe, avril 1934.

Jean Giono, "Je ne peux pas oublier", Europe, novembre 1934.

M. Gorki, "Avec qui êtes-vous, maîtres de la culture?", Europe, juin 1932.

George Grosz, Illustration, Europe, janvier 1929.

H.T. Hunt, "Documents et dossiers pour la liberté: l'Affaire Mooney et Billings", Europe, novembre 1929.

Louis Laloy, "Goethe et Beethoven", Europe, avril 1931.

Paul Nizan, "Aden Arabie", Europe, septembre 1930.

Paul Nizan, "Aden Arabie", Europe, octobre 1930.

Paul Nizan, "Aden Arabie", Europe, novembre 1930.

Paul Nizan, "Antoine Bloyé", Europe, juin 1933.

Paul Nizan, "Antoine Bloyé", Europe, juillet 1933.

Paul Nizan, "Antoine Bloyé", Europe, août 1933.

Paul Nizan, "Antoine Bloyé", Europe, septembre 1933.

Paul Nizan, "Antoine Bloyé", Europe, octobre 1933.

Paul Nizan, "Sur l'Humanisme", Europe, juillet 1935.

Léon Pierre-Quint, "Les caractères religieux du communisme",
Europe, juillet 1929.

Romain Rolland, "Un grand mystique indien : Ramakrishna",
Europe, février 1929.

Romain Rolland, "Un héros de l'Inde nouvelle : Vivekananda",
Europe, mars 1929.

Romain Rolland, "Le réveil national de l'Inde et les réveilleurs",
Europe, novembre 1929.

Romain Rolland, "Préface à l'autobiographie de Gandhi",
Europe, avril 1931.

Romain Rolland, "Le Congrès mondial d'Amsterdam", Europe, octobre 1932.

Romain Rolland, "Les Cinq", Europe, janvier 1933.

Romain Rolland, "L'individualiste aux abois", Europe, octobre 1933.

Romain Rolland, "L'Aquittement de Henri Guilbeaux", Europe,
février 1933.

Romain Rolland, "Lénine : l'Art et l'action", Europe, janvier 1934.

Jules Romains, "Pour que l'Europe soit", Europe, avril 1930.

Herman Simpson, "Pour la dialectique marxiste", Europe, mai 1934.

Ervin Sinko, "À propos du procès Rakosi", Europe, mars 1935.

Rabindranath Tagore, "Message à l'Angleterre", Europe, juillet 1930.

Léon Trotski, "Histoire de la Révolution russe", Europe, décembre 1932.

Léon Trotski, "Histoire de la Révolution russe", Europe, janvier 1933.

Pierre Vignard (trad), "Lettres de Sacco et de Vanzetti",
Europe, mai 1930.

Charles Vildrac, "Du P.C.D.F. à l'ancien combattant", Europe,
novembre 1934.

7. Articles from Vendredi (other than those
by Jean Gu  henno), cited in the text

Anon., "Les trois affaires Stavisky", Vendredi, No.1.

7 novembre 1935.

Anon., "Les écrivains en campagne", Vendredi, No.27,

8 mai 1936.

Anon., "La vague de grèves et sa signification", Vendredi, No.33,

19 juin 1936.

Anon., "Il faut dissoudre le conseil municipal de Paris", Vendredi,

No.81, 21 mai 1937.

Anon., "Le franc et la confiance", Vendredi, No.101, 8 octobre 1937.

Anon., "Le Congrès Radical", Vendredi, No.104, 29 octobre 1937.

Anon., "Banques Partout", Vendredi, No.116, 21 janvier 1938.

Anon., "Le Front Populaire est un serment", Vendredi, No.116,

21 janvier 1938.

Anon., "On demande à comprendre", Vendredi, No.117, 28 janvier 1938.

Anon., "Devant la crise. Et Après?", Vendredi, No. 123, 11 mars 1938.

Anon., "Les Nationaux n'ont pas voulu", Vendredi, No.124,

18 mars 1938.

Anon., "M. le dr. Goebbels "protecteur" du livre", Vendredi,

No.140, 1 juillet 1938.

Anon., "Notes politiques", Vendredi, No.147, 26 août 1938.

Anon., "Notes politiques", Vendredi, No.148, 2 septembre 1938.

Anon., "Quand l'Italie devient raciste", Vendredi, No.149,

9 septembre 1938.

Anon., "Les deux bras de la Croix-Tchécoslovaquie", Vendredi,

No. 153, 7 octobre 1938.

Anon., "Que veut l'Angleterre", Vendredi, No.154, 14 octobre 1938.

A.A. "Le fascisme italien et l'huile espagnol", Vendredi, No.93, 13 août 1937.

Actionnaire moyen, "Les révoltés de la Banque de France", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936.

Jacques Arnaud, "Et l'Affaire du C.S.A.R.?", Vendredi, No.130, 29 avril 1938.

Jacques Arnaud, "Ce que pense M. Emil Ludwig de l'Action des écrivains sur la politique", Vendredi, No.155, 21 octobre 1938.

Colette Aynard, "Jusqu'à nouvel ordre", Vendredi, No.15, 14 février 1936.

Collette Aynard-Thumen, "Le divorce et les femmes", Vendredi, No.87, 2 juillet 1937.

Victor Basch, "Un an après la victoire", Vendredi, No.79, 7 mai 1937.

Victor Basch, "Avant le second tour", Vendredi, No.102, 15 octobre 1938.

René Belin, "Les buts immédiats de l'action syndicale", Vendredi, No.40, 7 août 1936.

Julien Benda, "Littérature et idéologie", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936.

Julien Benda, "Hypocrisies fascistes", Vendredi, No.52, 30 octobre 1936.

Jean-Richard Bloch, "Empêchons le suicide de la France", Vendredi, No.41, 14 août 1936.

Pierre Bost, "Livre pas mort", Vendredi, No.79, 7 mai 1937.

Pierre Bost., "Il n'y pas tant de bons livres", Vendredi, No.106,
12 novembre 1937.

Pierre Bost, "Le cinéma", Vendredi, No.132, 13 mai 1938.

Joe Bousquet, "Le voyage soviétique de Louis Fischer",
Vendredi, No.36, 10 juillet 1936.

Marcel Braiband, "Comment les paysans sont spoliés par les
trusts", Vendredi, No.99, 23 septembre 1937.

Pierre Brossolette, "Franklin Roosevelt", Vendredi, No.13,
31 janvier 1936.

José Bruyr, "Chaud le Jazz", Vendredi, No. 108, 26 novembre 1937.

André Chamson, "Contre la guerre civile", Vendredi, No.6,
13 décembre 1935.

André Chamson, "Politique intérieure de l'Europe", Vendredi,
No.20, 20 mars 1936.

André Chamson, "Espoirs de la province", Vendredi, No.30,
29 mai 1936.

André Chamson, "Avis à nos traitres", Vendredi, No.40, 7 août 1936.

André Chamson, "Jeunesse d'Aujourd'hui... Au devant de la vie",
Vendredi, No.42, 20 août 1936.

André Chamson, "La justice est indivisible. Madrid en flammes",
Vendredi, No.55, 20 novembre 1936.

André Chamson, "Le vrai pacifisme", Vendredi, No.67,
12 février 1937.

André Chamson, "Disciplinés, mais non pas dupes", Vendredi,
No.71, 12 mars 1937.

Congrès International des écrivains pour la défense de la
culture, "Un Message", Vendredi, No.89, 16 juillet 1937.

André Chamson, "Les métamorphoses de la guerre", Vendredi, No.92,
6 août 1937.

André Chamson, "À la jeunesse", Vendredi, No.98, 16 septembre 1937.

André Chamson, "Que l'habilité cède au courage!", Vendredi,
No.99, 23 septembre 1937.

André Chamson, "Il y a complot contre les institutions républicaines",
Vendredi, No.108. 26 novembre 1937.

André Chamson, "Tervel: Méditation sur une victoire", Vendredi
No.115, 14 janvier 1938.

André Chamson, "De l'espoirs d'hier aux déceptions d'aujourd'hui",
Vendredi, No.118, 4 février 1938.

André Chamson, "J'aime à camper quand il fait beau", Vendredi,
No.127, 8 avril 1938.

André Chamson, "Être modérés ou être fermes ce n'est pas être
absurdes", Vendredi, No.136, 10 juin 1938,

André Chamson, "Echec à la guerre", Vendredi, No.138, 27 mai 1938.

André Chamson, "Que la Jeunesse bâtit sa ville", Vendredi,
No.143, 29 juillet 1938.

André Combe, "Autour de la Journée Internationale de la Jeunesse",
Vendredi, No.94, 29 août 1937.

François Crucy, "Roosevelt et les Maîtres du Crédit",
Vendredi, No.29, 22 mai 1936.

Eugène Dabit, "Quatre poètes d'U.R.S.S.", Vendredi, No.7,
20 décembre 1935.

"Déclaration (du C.V.I.A.-F.)" Vendredi, No.19, 13 mars 1936.

F. Delaisi, "Comment le Comité des Forges fait payer aux
Français le réarmement allemand", Vendredi, No.22, 3 avril 1936.

F. Delaisi, "La défense des classes moyennes", Vendredi, No.62,
8 janvier 1937.

André Delmas, "La réforme de l'enseignement", Vendredi, No.71,
12 mars 1937.

Lucien Descaves, "Littérature et journalisme", Vendredi,
No.30, 29 mai 1936.

Philippe Diolé, "Tchécoslovaquie 1938", Vendredi, No.141,
15 juillet 1938.

Philippe Diolé, "Comment l'Allemagne est Hitlérienne", Vendredi,
No.156, 28 octobre 1938.

J. Dupiol, "Bons du Trésor et avances de la Banque de France",
Vendredi, No.34, 26 juin 1936.

J. Duret, "Le déficit budgétaire", Vendredi, No.69, 12 février 1937.

Luc Durtain, "Une culture peut-elle être immortelle", Vendredi,
No.73, 26 mars 1937.

A. Dutheil, "Vrais responsables des assassinats", Vendredi, No.2,
14 novembre 1935.

George Duveau, "Proudhon, précurseur du Front Populaire",
Vendredi. No.32, 12 juin 1936.

B. Frachon, "Pour la dissolution des ligues fascistes", Vendredi, No.75, 9 avril 1937.

C. Freinet, "Pour l'Education nouvelle", Vendredi, No.21, 27 mars 1936.

Angel Galarza, "Les Dessous de la rebellion", Vendredi, No.40, 7 août 1936.

Paul Gérin, "La Cour Suprême contre la démocratie", Vendredi, No.67, 12 février 1937.

Paul Gérin, "Les fraudeurs de l'impôt", Vendredi, No.70, 5 mars 1937.

Paul Gérin, "L'École de l'avenir", Vendredi, No.85, 18 juin 1937.

Paul Gérin, "Les feint pouvoirs", Vendredi, No.87, 2 juillet 1937.

Paul Gérin, "Pourquoi creer une École d'Administration?", Vendredi, No.114, 7 janvier 1938.

P. Gérin, "M. Van Zeeland-sauvera-t-il son malade", Vendredi, No.118, 4 février 1938.

Paul Gérin, "La balance commerciale de la France est normalement déficitaire", Vendredi, No.121, 25 février 1938.

André Gide, "Il va de soi", Vendredi, No.64, 22 janvier 1937.

André Gide, "Lettre ouverte d'André Gide à Vendredi", Vendredi, No.112, 24 décembre 1937.

Louis Guilloux, "À la Jeunesse", Vendredi, No.17, 28 février 1936.

Imré Gyomai, "À la veille d'un nouveau coup de théâtre hitlérien", Vendredi, No.76, 16 avril 1937.

A. Harbaru, "Le "rexisme", fascisme belge", Vendredi, No.20,
20 mars 1936.

Pierre Herbart, "À propos de Retour de l'U.R.S.S. Lettre à
André Gide", Vendredi, No.55, 20 novembre 1936.

Pierre Herbart, "Sur Retour de l'U.R.S.S.", Vendredi, No.65,
29 janvier 1937.

Fritz Hoff, "Paris et la littérature allemande", Vendredi,
No.87, 2 juillet 1937.

André Hoschiller, "La journée internationale pour la défense de
la paix", Vendredi, No.82, 28 mai 1937.

Irène et Frédéric Joliot-Curie, "Radioactivité", Vendredi,
No.3, 21 novembre 1935.

Léon Jouhaux, "La C.G.T. à Vendredi, Vendredi, No.32, 12 juin 1936.

Léon Jouhaux, "La nationalisation des industries de guerre",
Vendredi, No.39, 31 juillet 1936.

Léon Jouhaux, "La Classe Ouvrière et l'intérêt général",
Vendredi, No.48, 2 octobre 1936.

Léon Jouhaux, "L'Expérience réussira", Vendredi, No.53,
6 novembre 1936.

Léon Jouhaux, "Le Grand Capital et les intérêts du pays",
Vendredi, No.57, 4 décembre 1936.

Léon Jouhaux, "Indépendance, Force, Raison", Vendredi, No.58,
11 décembre 1936.

Léon Jouhaux, "La dernière chance du libéralisme", Vendredi,
No.71, 12 mars 1937.

Léon Jouhaux, "Retour d'Espagne", Vendredi, No.82, 28 mai 1937.

Léon Jouhaux, "Collaboration, non subordination", Vendredi, No.93, 13 août 1937.

Francis Jourdain, "L'hitlérisme en Roumanie", Vendredi, No.25, 24 avril 1936.

Robert Lacoste, "L'unité du patronat", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936.

Robert Lacoste, "La C.G.T. et les Nationalisations", Vendredi, No.73, 26 mars 1937.

M. Lahy-Hollesbecque, "L'enfant et le travail professionnel", Vendredi, No. 13, 31 janvier 1936.

René Lalou, "Le Marxisme et la littérature", Vendredi, No.49, 9 octobre 1936.

François Lassagne, "Une semaine de Théâtre Populaire. Le 14 juillet de Romain Rolland" Vendredi, No.38, 24 juillet 1936.

Raymond Laubier, "Rumeurs sur la plage", Vendredi, No.40, 7 août 1936.

E. and G. Lefranc, "La portée psychologique de la culture ouvrière", Vendredi, No.35, 3 juillet 1936.

E. and G. Lefranc, "Nationalisation de l'enseignement", Vendredi, No.49, 9 octobre 1936.

John Lehmann, "La politique et les poètes anglais", Vendredi, No.39, 31 juillet 1936.

Jean Lévy-Besombes, "Je reviens d'Allemagne", Vendredi, No.152, 30 septembre 1938.

Léon Limon, "Où va l'Autriche", Vendredi, No.71, 12 mars 1937.

James Lloyd, "La loi anglaise sur la Presse", Vendredi,
No.57, 4 décembre 1936.

Paul Louis, "Le jeu de la diplomatie italienne", Vendredi,
No.62, 8 janvier 1937.

Marcelle Loutrel, "Le livre et le public", Vendredi, No.47,
25 septembre 1936.

Georges Lubin, "Vendue... le jour de des vingt ans", Vendredi,
No.72, 19 mars 1937.

Emil Ludwig, "Roosevelt", Vendredi, No.134, 27 mai 1938.

André Malraux, "Écrivains, culture, guerre", Vendredi No.1,
7 novembre 1935,

André Malraux, "Guadalajara", Vendredi, No.111, 17 décembre 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Christianisme et révolution", Vendredi,
No.32, 12 juin 1936.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Quand M. Pierre Laval passera en Haut
Cour", Vendredi, No.35, 2 juillet 1936.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "La justice-ennemi public", Vendredi,
No.50, 16 octobre 1936.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Le Juif et l'Allemand - vus par les
hitlériens", Vendredi, No.65, 29 janvier 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Le cléricalisme, violà l'ennemi!",
Vendredi, No.69, 26 février 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Il n'y a pas deux façons de faire la
guerre", Vendredi, No.83, 5^e juin 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Briand l'obstiné", Vendredi, No.85,
18 juin 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Que des chiens dévorants", Vendredi,
No.94, 20 août 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Huit jours en l'U.R.S.S.", Vendredi,
No.98, 16 septembre 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "L'Exécution de M. de la Roque",
Vendredi, No.105, 5 novembre 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Main tendue et main tirée", Vendredi,
No.113, 31 décembre 1937.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Pour vice de constitution il faut
réformer le Sénat", Vendredi, No.121, 15 avril 1938.

Louis Martin-Chauffier, "Lettre ouverte à Mussolini", Vendredi,
No.149, 9 septembre 1938.

Paul Nizan, "Une littérature responsable", Vendredi, No.1.
7 novembre 1935.

Paul Nizan, "La journée Bruxelloise", Vendredi, No.52,
30 octobre 1936.

Paul Nizan, "L'an prochain à Toulouse", Vendredi, No.74,
2 avril 1937.

A.P., "Et les grands travaux?", Vendredi, No.54, 13 novembre
1936.

G. Pasamonte, "En Espagne-Treize jours de guerre civile",
Vendredi, No.39, 1 aout 1936.

Magdeleine Paz, "Femmes à vendre", Vendredi, No.32, 12 juin 1936.

Jean Perrigault, "Quand j'étais prisonnier.. et complice des marchands d'opium chinois", Vendredi, No.91, 30 juillet 1937.

Jean Perrigault, "Les premières réformes pour le Maroc sont accordées", Vendredi, No.107, 19 novembre 1937.

Louis Pierard, "Regards sur l'Espagne en feu", Vendredi, No.41, 14 août 1936.

Louis Pierard, "Le PEN Club condamne le fascisme", Vendredi, No.46, 18 septembre 1936.

Marceau Pivert, "Pourquoi j'ai démissionné", Vendredi, No.70, 5 mars 1937.

Henri Polles, "La mauvaise réputation des Hommes de Lettres", Vendredi, No.95, 26 août 1937.

Henri Polles, "La Jeunesse littéraire d'aujourd'hui", Vendredi, No.141, 15 juillet 1938.

Jean Prévost, "La propagande est Maladive", Vendredi, No.140, 8 juillet 1938.

Charles Reber, "Catholiques et communistes dans le III Reich", Vendredi, No.79, 7 mai 1937.

Elie Richard, "Comment a été préparée la rébellion des généraux espagnols", Vendredi, No.44, 4 septembre 1936.

Rivet, Langevin, Alain, "Déclaration", Vendredi, No.19, 13 mars 1936.

Germaine Robert Castro, "L-avenement des femmes dans les syndicats", Vendredi, No.71, 12 mars 1937.

Romain Rolland, "Adieu à Gorki", Vendredi, No.34, 19 juin 1936.

Romain Rolland, "Adieu à Gorki", Vendredi, No.35, 3 juillet 1936.

Romain Rolland, "Antonio Gramsci", Vendredi, No.84, 11 juin 1937.

Carlo Rosselli, "Catalogne-bastion de l'Espagne", Vendredi,
No.54, 13 novembre 1936.

Edmond Schlesinger, "Admiration dangereuse", Vendredi, No.30,
29 mai 1936.

Edmond Schlesinger, "Pestalozzi n'est pas mort", Vendredi,
No.91, 30 juillet 1937.

Edmond Schlesinger, "On peut sauver l'enfance coupable",
Vendredi, No.97, 9 septembre 1937.

Edmond Schlesinger, "Une question délicate", Vendredi,
No.118, 4 février 1938.

G.B. Shaw, "La pseudo-crise constitutionnelle de la Grande-
Bretagne", Vendredi, No.63, 15 janvier 1937.

Wickham Steed, "Élections en Angleterre", Vendredi, No.3,
21 novembre 1935.

Wickham Steed, "Explication de l'Angleterre", Vendredi,
No.59, 18 décembre 1936.

SimoneTéry, "Une grande figure soviétique-Michel Koltzov",
Vendredi, No.18, 6 mars 1936.

Simone Téry, "Un écrivain soldat Gustave Regler", Vendredi,
No.144, 5 août 1938.

André Ulmann, "Notre enquête sur l'accident de Villejuif",
Vendredi, No.118, 4 février 1938.

"Vendredi", Vendredi vous parle... et accuse", Vendredi,
No.3, 21 novembre 1935.

"Vendredi de la femme", Vendredi, No.4, 28 novembre 1935.

"Vendredi", L'Encyclique du Prés. Roosevelt", Vendredi, No.10,
10 janvier 1936.

"Vendredi", "En attendant mieux", Vendredi, No.13, 31 janvier 1936.

"Vendredi" "Marche du Peuple de Paris, 16 février 1936", Vendredi,
No.16, 21 février 1936.

"Vendredi", "Après la victoire", Vendredi, No.27, 8 mai 1936.

"Vendredi", "Vers le pouvoir", Vendredi, No.28, 15 mai 1936.

"Vendredi", "14 juillet 1936 - Notre Serment", Vendredi, No.36,
10 juillet 1936.

"Vendredi", "Quelques lueurs - l'initiative du Président Roosevelt",
Vendredi, No.44, 4 septembre 1936.

"Vendredi", "Nécessaire et suffisant: Le Front Populaire",
Vendredi, No.45, 11 septembre 1936.

"Vendredi", "Aux idées justes les faits répondent", Vendredi,
No.47, 25 septembre 1936.

"Vendredi", "Où la politique commande le débat", Vendredi, No.48,
2 octobre 1936.

"Vendredi", "Ce que l'ordre exige!", Vendredi, No.49, 9 octobre 1936.

"Vendredi", "À nos amis radicaux", Vendredi, No.51, 23 octobre 1936.

"Vendredi", "Responsabilités Radicales", Vendredi, No.52,
30 octobre 1936.

"Vendredi", "Les Quatre Coins", Vendredi, No.56, 27 novembre 1936.

Vendredi introduction in Wickham Steed, "Explication de l'Angleterre", Vendredi, No.59, 18 décembre 1936.

"Vendredi", "Les quatre coins", Vendredi, No.61, 1 janvier 1937.

"Vendredi", "Toujours la paix", Vendredi, No.64, 22 janvier 1937.

"Vendredi", "Un "acte" de l'Elysée", Vendredi, No.67, 12 février 1937.

"Vendredi", "Forces de liberté", Vendredi, No.69, 26 février 1937.

"Vendredi", "Epargnons le sang de la France", Vendredi, No.72,
19 mars 1937.

"Vendredi", "Abattez le Mur!", Vendredi, No.78, 30 avril 1937.

"Vendredi", "Au bout d'un an", Vendredi, No.84, 11 juin 1937.

"Vendredi", "Calculs déjoués", Vendredi, No.88, 9 juillet 1937.

"Vendredi", "Contrôle et non-intervention", Vendredi, No.89,
16 juillet 1937.

"Vendredi", "De l'Ethiopie à la Chine", Vendredi, No.94,
20 août 1937.

"Vendredi", "Paroles de paix, actes de guerre", Vendredi, No.95,
26 août 1937.

"Vendredi", "Heures décisives", Vendredi, No.96, 2 septembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.101, 8 octobre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.103, 27 octobre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Un témoin de moralité", Vendredi, No.104,
29 octobre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.105, 5 novembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Notre ami Robinson et les comptes du Brésil",
Vendredi, No.107, 19 novembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.112, 24 novembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.108, 26 novembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.109, 3 décembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.110, 10 décembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.111, 17 décembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.112, 24 décembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.113, 31 décembre 1937.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.114, 7 janvier 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.115, 14 janvier 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.116, 21 janvier 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.118, 4 février 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.119, 11 février 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.120, 18 février 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.122, 4 mars 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.123, 11 mars 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.124, 18 mars 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.125, 25 mars 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.126, 1 avril 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.127, 8 avril 1938.

"Vendredi", "Nous pensons que", Vendredi, No.128, 15 avril 1938.

"Vendredi", "La grande semaine diplomatique", Vendredi, No.130,
24 avril 1938.

"Vendredi", "Face à l'Axe Berlin-Rome", Vendredi, No.132,
13 mai 1938.

"Vendredi", "Notes Politiques", Vendredi, No.151, 23 septembre 1938.

"Vendredi", "Le calvaire de la paix", Vendredi, No.152,
30 septembre 1938.

"Vendredi", "Établir enfin la paix", Vendredi, No.153, 7 octobre 1938.

"Vendredi", "Notes Politiques", Vendredi, No.155, 21 octobre 1938.

"Vendredi", "Une voie nouvelle s'impose à nous", Vendredi, No.158,
10 novembre 1938.

Andrée Viollis, "Problème colonial", Vendredi, No.4, 28 novembre 1935.

Andrée Viollis, "Attentat contre la paix", Vendredi, No.7,
20 décembre 1935.

Andrée Viollis, "Quelque notes sur Berlin", Vendredi, No.12, 24
janvier 1936.

Andrée Viollis, "Les femmes pour la liberté", Vendredi, No.17,
28 février 1936.

Andrée Viollis, "L'acte d'accusation contre Thaelmann et son
néant", Vendredi, No.23, 10 avril 1936.

A. Viollis, "Trois femmes ministres", Vendredi, No.32,
12 juin 1936.

Andrée Viollis, "Ce qu'attend l'Indochine", Vendredi, No.33,
19 juin 1936.

Andrée Viollis, "Le miracle du peuple Espagnol", Vendredi,
No.44, 4 septembre 1936.

Andrée Viollis, "Portraits animés. Romain Rolland", Vendredi,
No.61, 1 janvier 1937.

Andrée Viollis, "Madrid encore", Vendredi, No.73, 26 mars 1937.

Andrée Viollis, "Bilbao affamé demande des vivres", Vendredi,
No.78, 30 avril 1937.

Andrée Viollis, "Assez de comédie autour du drame espagnol",
Vendredi, No.86, 25 juin 1937.

Andrée Viollis, "Vienne sous la botte Nazie", Vendredi, No.125,
25 mars 1938.

Andrée Viollis, "Pitié pour les oiseaux", Vendredi, No.131,
6 mai 1938.

A. Viollis et Françoise Lassagne, "Assez de comédie autour du
drame espagnol", Vendredi, No.86, 25 juin 1937.

Emile Vandervelde, "Restons vigilants", Vendredi, No.76,
16 avril 1937.

Edmond Vermeil, "Après la rencontre des deux dictateurs",
Vendredi, No.100, 30 septembre 1937.

Prof. Edmond Vermeil, "La crise du III Reich", Vendredi, No.119,
11 février 1938.

Charles Vildrac, "Aspects de l'U.R.S.S.", Vendredi, No.12,
14 janvier 1936.

André Wurmser, "Les sanctions plus que jamais!". Vendredi, No.28,
15 mai 1936.

André Wurmser, "Il n'y a pas de Pyrénées", Vendredi, No.38,
24 juillet 1936.

André Wurmser, "Le Sénat : faiblesse de constitution", Vendredi,
No.87, 2 juillet 1937.

André Wurmser, "Les récidivistes de la provocation", Vendredi,
No.103, 27 octobre 1937.

8. Other works cited in the text

Diego Abad de Santillán, El Organismo Económico de la Revolución.
Barcelona, 1936.

Gay Wilson Allen, Walt Whitman Handbook. New York, Hendricks House,
1962.

Charles Andler, Nietzsche - sa vie et sa pensée. Paris, Gallimard,
1958, vol.III.

Raymond Aron, History and the Dialectic of Violence. Oxford,
Basil Blackwell, 1975.

Simone de Beauvoir, La force de l'âge. Paris, Coll. "Folio", 1952.

Julien Benda, La Trahison des clercs. Paris, Jean-Jacques Pauvert,
1965.

Madeleine Berry, André Chamson ou l'Homme contre l'Histoire. Paris,
Éditions Fischbacher, 1977.

Léon Blum, Du Mariage, in L'Oeuvre de Léon Blum, vo. 1905-1914,
Paris, Édit Albin Michel, 1962.

Léon Blum et Paul Boncour, "Sur la Crise", Le Temps, 16 mars 1938.

Pierre de Boisdeffre, Barrès parmi nous. Paris, Plon, 1969.

Pierre de Boisdeffre, Métamorphose de la littérature. Paris,
Alsatia, 1963.

Murray Bookchin, The Spanish Anarchists. The Heroic Years 1868-
1936. New York Free life editions, 1977.

Richard M. Bucke, Walt Whitman, Philadelphia, David McKay, 1883.

Albert Camus, "Avant-Propos", in Louis Guilloux, La maison du peuple.
Paris, Grasset, Livre de Poche, 1953.

Albert Camus, L'homme révolté. Paris, Gallimard, 1962.

Albert Camus, La Peste. Paris, Gallimard, 1963.

René Albrecht Carrié, France, Europe and the two world wars.
Westpoint, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1975.

David Caute, Communism and the French Intellectuals 1914-1960.
London, André Deutsch, 1964.

David Caute, The Fellow Travellers. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson
Limited, 1973.

Louis-Ferdinand Céline, Mea Culpa. In Oeuvres de Céline, Édition
présentée par Frédéric Vitaux, Paris, Aux Éditions du Club
de l'Honnête Homme, 1981, tome 4.

Bruno de Cessole, "George Orwell", Valeurs Actuelles, 14 février
1983.

André Chamson, Devenir ce qu'on est. Paris, Éd. Wesmael-Charlier,
coll: Les auteurs juges de leurs oeuvres, 1959.

André Chamson, Il faut vivre vieux. Paris, Grasset and Fasquelle,
1984.

André Chamson, Roux le bandit. London, George G. Harrap & Co. 1958.

Donald G. Charlton, Positivist Thought in France 1852-1870.
Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1959.

Noam Chomsky, American power and the new mandarins. New York,
Random House, Pantheon Books, 1969.

André Cuisenier, Jules Romains et Les Hommes de Bonne Volonté.
Paris, Flammarion, 1954, vol.111.

Eugène Dabit, Hôtel du Nord. Paris, Éditions Denoel et Steele, 1929.

Eugène Dabit, Journal Intime (1928-1936). Paris, Gallimard, 1939.

Jean David, Le procès de l'intelligence. Paris, Librairie Nizet, 1966.

J. Debû-Bridel, éd., La Résistance Intellectuelle. Paris, Julliard, 1970.

J. Delperrié de Bayac, Histoire du Front Populaire. Paris, Fayard, 1972.

Roland Dorgelès, Les Croix de Bois. Paris, Albin Michel, 1959.

Maurice Dubourg, Eugène Dabit et André Gide. Paris, Maurice Pernet, coll. "Plaisir du bibliophile", 1953.

Ilya Ehrenbourg, Men, Years - Life, vol.IV, Eve of War 1933-1941
Translated by T. Shebunina and Y. Kapp. London, Macgibbon and Kee, 1963.

Flandin, La Revue de Paris. 1 avril 1937, Quoted in Paul Gérin,
"Quand les banques gouvernent", Vendredi, No.75, 9 avril 1937.

André Gide, The journals of André Gide. vol.111, trans.

Justin O'Brien. London. Secker and Warburg, 1949, Entry for
the 3rd August 1935.

Harvey Goldberg, The Life of Jean Jaurès. Madison, Milwaukee and
London, University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the prison notebooks of
Antonio Gramsci. Trans. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith. London,
Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.

N. Greene, Crisis and Decline: The French Socialist Party in
the Popular Front Era. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University
Press, 1969.

Daniel Guérin, Front populaire révolution manquée. Paris,
Maspero, 1970.

Louis Guilloux, Carnets 1921-1944. Paris, Gallimard, 1978.

Louis Guilloux, Compagnons. Paris, Grasset, 1931.

Louis Guilloux, La maison du peuple. Paris, Grasset, 1953.

Louis, Guilloux, Le Sang Noir. Paris, Gallimard, 1935.

Daniel Halévy, Essais sur le mouvement ouvrier en France.
Paris, Société nouvelle de librairie et d'édition. 1901.

Daniel Halévy, Péguy et les Cahier de la Quinzaine. Paris,
Grasset, 1941.

Marc Hanrez éd., Drieu la Rochelle. Paris, Cahiers de L'Herne, 1982.

Berthold Hinz, Art in the Third Reich. Oxford, Basil Blackwell,
1980.

Joseph Hoffman, L'Humanisme de Malraux. Paris, Librairie C.
Klincksieck, 1963.

Humayun Kabir, Preface, in Rabindranath Tagore, Towards Universal
Man. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1967.

Humayun Kabir, Introduction, in Rabindranath Tagore, Towards
Universal Man. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1967.

Walter Kaufmann, Nietzsche - Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist.
Cleveland and New York, World Publishing Co, coll. "Meridian Books",
1966.

Joseph Kvapil, Romain Rolland et les Amis d'Europe. Prague, Statni
Pedagogicke nakladatelstvi, 1971.

Jean Lacouture, André Malraux : Une vie dans le siècle. Paris,
Le Seuil, Collection Points, 1973.

Georges Lefranc, Le Syndicalisme en France. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, "Que sais-je" 1964.

Philippe Lejeune, Le pacte autobiographique. Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1975.

George Lichtheim, Marxism-An historical and critical study. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

Herbert R. Lottman, La Rive gauche. (Marianne Véron trans.). Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1981.

W. Lough, "Introduction", in André Chamson, Roux le Bandit. London, George G. Harrap and Co. 1958.

Paul Louis, Histoire du socialisme en France 1789-1945. Paris, Librairie Marcel Rivière, 1945.

André Malraux, La Condition humaine. Paris, Gallimard, 1933.

André Malraux, La tentation de l'Occident. Paris, Grasset, 1956.

André Malraux, "D'une jeunesse européenne", Ecrits, Les Cahiers Verts, 70, Paris, Grasset, 1927.

Roger Martin du Gard, Les Thibault. L'Été 1914. Paris, Gallimard, vol. VI, 1953.

Roger Martin du Gard, Les Thibault. L'Été 1914. Paris, Gallimard, Oeuvres complètes 11, 1955.

Karl Marx, Theses on Feuerbach, in Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1976, vol.5.

Zareer Masani, "India's middle-class messiah", New Statesman, 10th December 1982.

Mary Jean Matthews Green, Louis Guilloux - An artisan of Language.
York, South Carolina, French Literature Publishing Co., 1980.

Georges May, L'autobiographie. Paris, Presses Universitaires
de France, 1979.

Lucie Mazaauric avec André Chamson, Ah Dieu! Que la paix est jolie.
Paris, Librairie Plon, 1972.

Patrick McCarthy, Céline. London, Allen Lane, Penguin Books, 1975.

Jules Moch, Le Front Populaire, grande espérance. Paris,
Librairie Académique Perrin, 1971.

Michel de Montaigne, Les Essais, in Les Essais de Michel de
Montaigne, éd. Pierre Villey. Paris, Presses Universitaires
de France, 1978.

Robert J. Niess, Julien Benda. Michigan, The University of
Michigan Press, 1956.

Friedrich Nietzsche, Ecce Homo. 1908, II, I, Quoted in Walter
Kaufmann, Nietzsche-Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist.

Friedrich Nietzsche, Parable of the Madman in The Joyful Wisdom,
Trans. Thomas Cannon. London, T.N. Foulis, 1910.

Friedrich Nietzsche, La Volonté de puissance, Paris, tome 1, p.19.
Quoted in C.D.V.E. pp.133-134.

Paul Nizan, Antoine Bloyé. Paris, Grasset 1933.

Paul Nizan, Les chiens de garde. Paris, Maspero, 1969.

Paul Nizan, "L'ennemi public No.1 ", Regards, No.61, 4 mars 1935.

Paul Nizan, "Notes-programme sur la philosophie" in Paul Nizan
Intellectuel communiste 1926-1940. présentation J.J. Brochier.
Paris, Maspero 1967.

Léon Noël, La guerre de '39 a commencé quatre ans plus tôt.
Paris, Éditions France-Empire, 1979.

George Orwell, Homage to Catalonia. London, Secker and Warburg,
1959.

Georges Pascal, La pensée d'Alain. Paris, Bordas, coll:
"Collection pour connaître", 1957.

W.D. Redfern, Paul Nizan, Committed literature in a conspiratorial
world. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1972.

Walter Redfern, The private world of Jean Giono. Oxford,
Basil Blackwell, 1967.

Ernest Renan, L'Avenir de la Science. Paris, Calmann-Lévy,
Oeuvres complètes, 1949.

Leonard H. Rolfe, The novels of André Chamson. New York,
Washington, Hollywood, Vantage Press, 1971.

Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, Terre des hommes. Paris, Gallimard,
1939.

Jean Sarocchi, Julien Benda-Portrait d'un intellectuel.
Paris, A.G. Nizet, 1968.

Jean-Paul Sartre, Critique de la raison dialectique. Paris,
Gallimard, 1960.

Jean-Paul Sartre, La Nausée. Paris, Livre de Poche, 1959.

Uwe M. Schneede, George Grosz - His life work. London, Gordon Fraser,
1979.

A. Sheridan Smith, Glossary in his translation of Jean-Paul Sartre,
Critique of Dialectical Reason. London, N.L.B., 1976.

Alain Silvera, Daniel Halévy and his times. Ithaca New York, Cornell University Press, 1966.

Alfred Spire, Inventaire des Socialismes français contemporains. Paris, Librairie de Medicis, Éditions Politiques, Economiques et Sociales, 1945.

William Thomas Starr, Romain Rolland : One Against All. A Biography. The Hague, Mouton, 1971.

H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society. London, Macgibbon and Kee, 1959.

H. Stuart Hughes, The Obstructed Path. New York, Evanston, London, Harper and Row, Harper Torchbooks, 1969.

Rabindranath Tagore, Nationalism. London, Macmillan and Co. 1917.

Radindranath Tagore, Towards Universal Man. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1967.

Albert Thibaudet, La République des Professeurs. Geneva, Slatkine Reprints. Coll: "Resources", 1979.

Micheline Tison-Braun, La crise de l'humanisme. Paris, Librairie Nizet, 1958.

Philippe Viet, "Claude Polin - Le totalitarisme", Valeurs Actuelles, 14 février 1983.

Andrée Viollis, Indochine S.O.S. Paris, Gallimard, 1935.

H.W.Wardman, Ernest Renan - A Critical Biography. London, University of London, Athlone Press, 1964.

P. Warwick, The French Popular Front. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Alexander Werth, The Twilight of France 1933-1940. London,
Hamish Hamilton, 1942.

Edmund Wilson, To the Finland Station. London, Collins,
Fontana Library, 1962.

Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1977.
vol.2.